

The Southern Speech Journal

VOLUME XXIV

FALL 1958

NUMBER 1

PAPERS IN MEMORY OF DALLAS C. DICKEY (1904-1957)

THOSE OF US in the Southern Speech Association who knew Dr. Dallas C. Dickey as an undergraduate teacher and director of debate remember his incisive but tolerant criticism of our ideas. Those of us who knew him as a graduate instructor remember his love of history and his appreciation of all the forces represented in the rhetoric of a culture. Those of us who knew him as a director of research remember his insistence upon accuracy, thoroughness, and clarity. Those of us who knew him as a scholar remember his fine biography of Seargent T. Prentiss. Those of us who knew him as a colleague remember the fun of conversation over a cup of coffee. Those of us who knew him as a friend remember his kindness, his sense of humor, and his love of humanity—plus his delight with his garden, his antiques, and an occasional game of golf or fishing trip. Those of us who knew him as a member of the Southern Speech Association remember the establishment of the student congress while he was president, the growth of the JOURNAL while he was editor, and the series of articles on the history of the Association which he finished shortly before his death.

As editor of the projected Speech Association of America volume on public address in the South, Dr. Dickey was planning a sectional program for the 1958 annual convention of the Southern Speech Association. That program was arranged as he had planned it. Furthermore, it was possible after his death in August, 1957, to schedule a program of scholarly papers in his memory for the third general session of the convention. The participants on that program, representing diverse areas of speech scholarship, were selected because of their close association with Dr. Dickey, as students or colleagues, during his eleven years at Louisiana State University and his eleven years at the University of Florida. The articles that follow have resulted from the papers presented at Houston.

BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER'S LOTTERY
SPEECH, NEW ORLEANS, 1891

WAYNE C. EUBANK

AS EARLY AS 1810 the Orleans Territorial Legislature had approved a lottery to raise ten thousand dollars to aid the Christ Episcopal Church in New Orleans. During the next thirty years, many lotteries were approved by the Louisiana Legislature, primarily for churches, public institutions and internal improvements. The close of the Civil War found Louisiana State finances in critical condition. The Louisiana General Assembly of 1866, which authorized the sale of lottery tickets, often referred to as the "Negro Legislature," was the most corrupt body to govern the state during the reconstruction era. However, the General Assembly was composed of some very capable men, some of the outstanding citizens of the state. Since about ninety per cent of the money poured into the lottery came from the sale of tickets outside of Louisiana, they viewed the lottery as a means of bettering the poor financial condition of Louisiana.¹

An attempt had been made in 1867 by Charles T. Howard and Associates to secure rights to conduct lottery drawings. The bill, which did not carry lottery monopoly rights, was postponed indefinitely. This momentary defeat for Howard and Associates resulted in a complete victory for them in the 1868 Legislature. By bribing the carpet-baggers and Negroes and appealing to native Louisianians to better the state's financial structure, Howard was able to secure the passage of a bill chartering the Louisiana State Lottery Company for twenty-five years with complete monopoly rights. The Company was organized with a capital stock of one

Mr. Eubank (Ph.D., Louisiana State University, 1942) is Professor of Speech and Chairman of the Department of Speech at the University of New Mexico.

¹The best works on the Louisiana Lottery are: Buel, C. C. "The Degradation of a State," *The Century Magazine*, Vol. XLIII, February, 1892, pp. 618-632; Alwes, Berthold C., "The History of the Louisiana State Lottery Company," *The Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XXVII, October, 1944, pp. 964-1118 (complete manuscript of the original masters thesis in history, Louisiana State University, 1929); Williams, Thomas Harry, *P. G. T. Beauregard: Napoleon in Grey*, (Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1954), Chapter XVIII.

million dollars. The state charged a license fee of \$40,000 annually and exempted the Company from all other licenses and taxes.

For the next twenty years, through bribery, black-mail, and whatever type of unscrupulous procedure necessary, the Louisiana State Lottery Company dominated the political, social, and economic life to the state. Seldom was the State Legislature or the financial structure of New Orleans from under the control of the lottery. The wealth of the Company grew beyond the fondest expectations. Some estimates of the gross ticket sales ran as high as \$29,000,000 a year. Since only fifty-two per cent of the gross intake was returned to ticket-holders in prizes, the net profit of the Company was fabulous. Dividends on lottery stock ran as high as one hundred and seventy per cent per year. From 1870 to 1890 it was estimated that the net annual income of the Company ranged between five and eleven million dollars.

To avoid the accusation that drawings favored the friends of the lottery, Howard employed General P. G. T. Beauregard and Lt. General Jubal A. Early, Southern stalwarts of the Civil War, to supervise the wheels. Thus did the Louisiana Lottery Company cloak itself in Southern patriotism, dignity, and honesty.

II

By the late 1880's more and more of the populace of Louisiana were becoming aroused by the power of the lottery and the idea that the state should sponsor the institution of gambling. Early in 1890, when John A. Morris, original founder and stockholder in the lottery announced that he would apply to the Louisiana Legislature for an extension of the lottery charter for twenty-five years, the Anti-Lottery League of Louisiana was organized. The first meeting of the League was held in New Orleans, February 28, 1890. Leagues soon sprang up in parishes throughout the state. On August 7, 1890, a convention of anti-lottery delegates met in Baton Rouge. Fifty-three parishes sent representatives to the convention. On August 8, the second day of the convention, the delegates voted the establishing of a newspaper to champion the anti-lottery cause. Thus the *Daily New Delta* of New Orleans was born with C. Harrison Parker as editor-in-chief. This move was essential to the anti-lottery

cause since about ninety per cent of the parish papers and all of the New Orleans newspapers were controlled by the Lottery Company.

III

One of the largest and most important meetings held by the Anti-Lottery League during the campaign convened in the Grand Opera House, New Orleans, June 25, 1891. The Chancellor of Tulane University, Colonel William Preston Johnston, presided. Benjamin Morgan Palmer, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans, delivered the principal address. The Opera House was filled to capacity and excitement ran through the audience as Chancellor Johnston introduced Palmer saying, "It is now my privilege to introduce to you a man who by his talent, his eloquence, and his virtues, well deserves the title of the first citizen of New Orleans."² As Palmer stepped forward to speak, rounds of applause greeted the exalted minister.³

At the outset of his introduction, Palmer charged the Lottery Company of Louisiana as constituting an immoral institution whose business and avowed aim was to propagate gambling throughout the state. Near the end of his introduction, Palmer presented the central idea of his speech, "I lay the indictment against the Louisiana Lottery Company that its continued existence is incompatible, not only with the safety, but with the being of the state."⁴ Continuing, Palmer declared that he was not "simply uttering the language of denunciation" but that he had framed the indictment and he intended to support each contention with adequate proof.

Palmer opened the main body of the speech by declaring the lottery's legal right to exist comparable to the right of existence of a syndicate to propagate leprosy, a syndicate to extend the advantages of lying, a syndicate to promote murder. To punctuate the above illustrations, he declared: . . . "I put the lottery upon the same moral plane with these cases which I have mentioned." In closing his remarks on the above charges Palmer reiterated that the

²*Daily New Delta*, New Orleans, Louisiana, June 26, 1891.

³Johnson, Thomas Cary, *Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, (The Cumberland Press, Nashville, Tennessee, 1906), 554.

⁴Copies of Palmer's speech may be found in *Daily New Delta*, June 26, 1891; *Southwestern Presbyterian*, July 2, 1891; and Johnson's *Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, 554.

lottery was "an institution that antagonized the state and the people and all their interests," and propounded the disjunction: . . . "either the lottery must go or Louisiana is lost."

Proceeding to the first main argument upon which he spent about one-half of his time, Palmer denounced the lottery declaring that its existence was contrary to the "first physical matter which forms a basis upon which human society rests . . . the law of labor." Paraphrasing the Biblical phrase "In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt earn they bread," Palmer maintained that since the creation it had been a fundamental and universal law that each unit of society lived by his individual and personal labor. To illustrate this point, Palmer employed two examples, the farmer and the manufacturer. After extolling the creative virtues of the farmer and the manufacturer, Palmer asked, "what value does the gambler ever create? What new value does he ever stamp upon the value which existed antecedently?"

Seeking to avoid accusation by the lottery that professional men were a non-creative class, Palmer contended that doctors, lawyers, ministers, and others in similar professions, while not in the strict sense producers, added to the value of what was created and rendered secure the investments of the products of the creators.

Continuing the argument Palmer contended that one of the plainest principles of ethics stated that what a man has no right to do, he has no right to bargain to do.

The man who stakes his property has no right to stake that property on a chance, and the man who won the property upon that stake had no original right to take it. It was neither a gift nor a purchase and consequently the agreement between the parties, to stand simply by the chance, was an immoral agreement and no legislature can possibly make it legitimate.

Proceeding to the second main point in the development of the speech, Palmer denounced the lottery for promoting the principle that some should live upon the losses of those who were unlucky—that the few were enriched through the poverty of the many. He expressed the belief that if the lottery existed for another quarter of a century, much of the wealth of the state would be transferred into the hands of a few. Pronouncing that the people of Louisiana would not tolerate such a condition, Palmer issued the battle cry declaring, "If this lottery cannot be destroyed by forms of law, it must unquestionably be destroyed by actual revolution."

Closing his argument Palmer accused the lottery of becoming the apostle of gambling, a school for instruction in gambling.

It [the lottery] becomes a propagandist of gambling. It goes forth under the charter of the state to persuade man, woman, child where ever they meet to gamble. It carries the solicitation into our very homes. It meets our cooks when they are going with a basket to get the master's breakfast and induces them to gamble. . . . What I charge, therefore, upon the lottery is not simply that it is a gambling concern but that it is an university for the instruction in gambling.

In advance of his peroration, Palmer pronounced that before half of the twenty-five years had elapsed, if the charter of the lottery were renewed, every citizen able to leave the state would depart. Referring to the bribery tactics of the lottery, Palmer predicted that within ten years after its re-chartering the lottery would carry every governor of the state in its pocket "remove every honest judge from the bench, and put their men in the places to do their bidding. . . ."

Marshalling pathetic proof, for which he was justly famous, Palmer began his conclusion by reminding the audience that although he had not been born upon the soil of Louisiana, he was her son by adoption and that for thirty-five years he had labored in the honest interests of her people. Declaring that it was not within his power to abandon the state since his dead were buried there and the "narrow house" already built in which he would soon begin his quiet repose, he appealed for the immediate redemption of the land of his adoption asking, ". . . are we, sir, to abandon such a land as this, created by beneficent heaven and secured by the patriotism of the fathers that went before us? Are we to deliver her, bound hand and foot, to such an enemy as this?"

Reminding his audience that no isolated community could long endure against the moral convictions of the world, Palmer alluded to the Civil War and the defeat of the institution of slavery. Applying the analogy to the lottery Palmer predicted its ultimate defeat by declaring that:

The moral sentiment of mankind is against the lottery, and all the countries that have given it a temporary existence have found that it exhausted the resources of the land and have more or less divested themselves of the curse.

IV

The effect of Palmer's speech upon the listening audience was instantaneous and electrifying. Before him were many of the most respectable citizens of New Orleans, the major portion of whom were ladies. During the early part of the speech the audience had listened with rapt attention. But when Palmer reached the first climax in which he "classed the lottery with the Mafia" and predicted for the lottery a fate similar to that inflicted upon the Mafia, "there was an outburst of applause as sudden as an explosion and tremendous as a storm. Men stood up in their places and shouted themselves hoarse, while delicate women waved their handkerchiefs and responded to the storm of passion."⁵

Similar demonstrations within the audience occurred when Palmer reached the second climax in his speech declaring that if the lottery could not be destroyed by law, it would unquestionably be destroyed by actual revolution. In commenting upon Palmer's power over the audience the *Daily Picayune* declared, "Seldom has there been a more signal demonstration of the power of eloquence which showed itself able to move the best people to acts of the most tremendous import."⁶ Continuing, the *Daily Picayune* ventured to predict that a mixed multitude below the level of the audience to which Palmer was speaking might have been "driven to almost any enterprise."

Although Palmer's speech was well received by his listening audience, a close examination of the content reveals pronounced inadequacies. There is no evidence of careful research upon the issue. Sweeping generalizations, questionable analogies, and, in many instances, lack of information and adequate support, cloaked in a rather belligerent and revolutionary spirit, were not questioned by his immediate audience. However, this did not excuse the speaker from assuming his rightful task. Even though Palmer knew that the audience was biased in his favor, he should have built a strong factual and logical case against the lottery. Apparently

⁵Editorial in the *Daily Picayune*, New Orleans, June 6, 1891. Rabbi Leucht of New Orleans declared: "I have heard the foremost American public speakers, in the pulpit, or on the rostrum. . . but I give you my word, sir, that night Dr. Palmer did not permit me to think for myself, not to feel for myself, not to will for myself, but picked me up and carried me whithersoever he would."

⁶*Ibid.*

he failed to remember his invisible audience: the tens of thousand of citizens throughout Louisiana who would read the speech or excerpts from the speech in the quiet of their homes far from the excitement of the Opera House.

The comparison of the lottery organization to an organization in the interest of teaching murder, to a syndicate for propagating leprosy, to a university teaching lying and stealing, may have been colorful; but such analogies would not stand close scrutiny. Palmer's charge that if the lottery were rechartered, before the half of twenty-five years elapsed every man able to leave the state of Louisiana would abandon it, was mere assertion. Furthermore, his statement that if the lottery were rechartered it would, in less than ten years, carry in its pocket every governor in the state and remove every honest judge from the bench was pure conjecture. Palmer's declaration that "if this lottery cannot be destroyed by forms of law, it must be destroyed by actual revolution" drew criticism even from the anti-lottery press.

In general, the speech lacked the clear organization so characteristic of Palmer's style. It is difficult to believe that Palmer would have laboriously prepared a speech so vulnerable to attack. The probability is that he had not painstakingly prepared the speech but depended primarily upon his acquaintance with and strong feelings toward the issue to carry him through the occasion. On the other hand, he should have known the press would be present and that his speech in full would be printed for scrutiny by the press and the public. Palmer's strong convictions on the issue, fanned at times by a near hysterical audience, may have accounted for the over-extension of his rhetoric.

V

The pro-lottery press in New Orleans and throughout the state lost no time in trying to capitalize upon the weaknesses in the speech and particularly upon the severity of Palmer's attack upon the lottery. Every major contention in the speech came under the immediate attack of the New Orleans press which, in the main, was merciless in its abuse of the speech and of Palmer.

The *Times Democrat* spoke out vehemently against the doctrines of the speech stating:

. . . We denounce the doctrine he preaches as pernicious, destructive, and indefensible. . . . The doctrine that a handful of self-ordained saints may legislate as to what the people shall or shall not have, and are authorized to execute their enactments, if need be, by the sword of force, is a doctrine obnoxious to the rights, to the tradition, and to the manhood of our people.⁷

The editor of the *Daily City Item*, after stating that Palmer's speech presented a spirit of violence which ill became his sacred calling, pointed up the statement that Palmer advocated "a resort to force, to arms, the last resource of despots and fanatics."⁸ Concluding its attack on Palmer and on the speech the *Item* declared:

It is a matter of relatively very little importance whether the people accept the lottery amendment or not, but it is of tremendous import to know whether they are free to do as they like about it or must subordinate their will to a band of self-constituted censors, who virtually threaten a rebellion in case their whims are not allowed to control the public policy.⁹

The following Monday the *Item* carried an article entitled, "Palmer Fancies vs. Solid Facts."¹⁰ The article attacked Palmer's statement that both capital and population were being driven from the state by the existence of the lottery. The next issue of the *Item* pointed out the fallacy in Palmer's argument that if the lottery were rechartered it would carry in its pockets every governor and judge in the state.¹¹

Rounding out the pro-lottery press attack on Palmer, the *Daily States* carried an article on its editorial page entitled, "Shall it Be Revolution?" After citing the highlights of Palmer's speech, the *Daily States* concluded:

We know of no way of answering such incongruous comparisons and ferocious extravagancies. An excited and unreasonable mind, a mind that jumps the boundaries of reason and law and ranges at will in the realms of fancy, can readily draw a comparison between any of the things of the universe.¹²

⁷Editorial in the *Times Democrat*, New Orleans, June 29, 1891.

⁸Editorial in the *Daily City Item*, New Orleans, June 27, 1891.

⁹*Ibid.*

¹⁰*Ibid.*, June 29, 1891

¹¹*Ibid.*, June 30, 1891.

¹²Editorial in the *Daily States*, New Orleans, June 26, 1891. The section of the speech in which Palmer declared, "If this lottery cannot be destroyed by forms of law, it must then be destroyed by actual revolution" drew unfavorable comment from newspapers outside Louisiana, e.g., The New York *Evening Post* and the Cincinnati *Enquirer*.

The *Weekly Times Democrat* joined the New Orleans daily papers in their condemnation of Palmer's speech. Prefacing its remarks with the hope that the lottery question would be debated with sobriety and not passion, the *Times Democrat* expressed great disappointment and sorrow over the speech delivered by Palmer. Particular attention was given to Palmer's statement that the lottery must go even if revolution were necessary. The *Times Democrat* declared:

Dropped from the cool heights of his vocation into the hot arena of politics, Dr. Palmer delivered a discourse which, on its ultimate analysis, is a conditional injunction to the shedding of blood. The same style of oratory employed by Dr. Palmer on Thursday is the style of oratory which has fed the fire stakes with martyrs and which has rent the States of the world with civil strife.¹³

The pro-lottery press throughout the state was quick to follow in line with the New Orleans press. With few exceptions, the attitude of the Parish press corresponded with the vicious attacks of the New Orleans papers.

Many of the Parish papers carried excerpts from the New Orleans pro-lottery press and others added their own brand of condemnation. The Covington *St. Tammany Farmer* declared:

Rev. B. M. Palmer, the eminent pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, of New Orleans, seems to be something of a bull-dozer, for he says that if the lottery amendment can not be defeated at the polls there must be a "revolution"; in other words, shooting, cutting, slashing, riot, murder, etc., must be the order of the day. To preach such a doctrine, it occurs to us is rather an incongruous role for the follower of the meek and lowly Nazarene to assume.¹⁵

Commenting upon the "parson in politics," the *Thibodaux Sentinel* commented:

There is no doubt that Dr. Palmer's speech has done injury to his own cause, and this will be more and more apparent whenever the full force of the reaction comes. The American people do not like the "parson in politics" and their disgust is all the greater when an honored minister like Dr. Palmer lets his zeal carry him into a fanatical crusade at the very outset.¹⁶

¹³Editorial in the *Weekly Times Democrat*, New Orleans, July 3, 1891.

¹⁴Four out of twenty Parish papers examined carried some defense of Palmer. In general, this defense consisted of upholding Palmer's right to speak on the lottery issue, not his arguments.

¹⁵*St. Tammany Farmer*, Covington, Louisiana, July 11, 1891.

¹⁶*The Thibodaux Sentinel*, Century, Louisiana, July 11, 1891.

Pointing up the revolutionary tone of Palmer's speech, the *Pioneer of Assumption* remarked:

If the utterances of Dr. Palmer correctly reflect the sentiments of the Antis—and the applause that the reverend gentleman received from those at the Opera House last night, especially upon the two occasions when he hinted at a resort to force to defeat the pending lottery revenue proposition, indicates that he does, there can no longer be a doubt that they will not only refuse to accept an adverse decision by the duly constituted Democratic party, but even a decision by the people themselves at the ballot box will be combatted even to the extent of "revolution."¹⁷

The *Weekly Advocate* of Baton Rouge carried a number of very uncomplimentary articles on Palmer's speech. The following quotation was typical.

The anti-lottery leaders made a grave mistake when they invited Rev. Dr. Palmer to open the campaign for them, and the minister made a mistake still graver in accepting the invitation. Both of these facts are now apparent, and Dr. Palmer's friends would gladly recall the error he made if they could do so. Their chargin was also equalled by the regret of those who have felt it to be their duty to criticize harshly his rash and inappropriate language.¹⁸

The *Opelousas Courier* added its rebuke of Dr. Palmer's utterances:

We must confess to a considerable degree of surprise when we find a man like Dr. Palmer, leaving his pulpit and taking the stump to declaim in bigoted language against a measure which concerns the material interests of our state.¹⁹

Quoting from Palmer's famous Thanksgiving sermon in defense of slavery, 1860, the *Opelousas Courier* condemned Palmer for his inconsistency in advocating tolerance towards slavery and intolerance towards those supporting the lottery.

It occurs to us that this same minister upon a former occasion used language something like this: "Thanks be to Almighty God, the domain of thought is sacred and can not be invaded by the boldest tyrant that ever lived; you may manacle my limbs and chain my body to a stone wall, but the tyrant never lived upon this globe who can imprison my thoughts and prevent me from thinking as I deem to be right." How is it that the same speaker now seems to be so intolerant of the opinions of others upon a question of such vital import-

¹⁷The *Pioneer of Assumption*, Napoleonville, Louisiana, July 4, 1891.

¹⁸The *Weekly Advocate*, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, July 4, 1891.

¹⁹The *Opelousas Courier*, Opelousas, Louisiana, July 11, 1891.

ance as the revenue amendment? . . . The ghost in the past lives again. Rev. Dr. Palmer, in 1860, preached secession and war in defense of the divine institution of human slavery. Did he go with the gospel or with the passions of the time?²⁰

The *Louisiana Democrat Weekly* of Alexandria called attention to the inappropriateness of Palmer's remarks on the lottery, declaring:

The Antis are growing desperate in this and the other towns throughout the state. In their different arguments against the lottery they lose their reasoning powers and rant and howl considerably. In New Orleans at the opening of the anti-lottery campaign, the Rev. Dr. Palmer made an idiotic showing of himself. Instead of setting a good example and trying to do all in his power to counsel peace and quiet, he has assumed the role of a bull-dozer. The sooner he and other men of the anti side quit such blusterings, the better; no sensible, sane man can follow such advocates.²¹

The *Louisiana Democrat Weekly* continued its attack against Palmer's anti-Christian and revolutionary attitude in the July 15, 1891 issue:

As an Anti, and as a man, we can not endorse nor be led by a man who would murder his neighbor for opinion's sake, but believe such a course should be repelled—by force if necessary. . . . Such advice is unbecoming in a minister, and God himself can but look upon such a disciple with a mingled feeling of pity and disgust.²²

The New Orleans press delighted in reprinting excerpts from anti-lottery Parish papers that denounced Palmer. A typical example appeared in the *Daily City Item*.

That zealous anti-lottery paper, the Farmerville Gazette, boldly condemns the torch, turpentine and rifle ideas set forth from the Grand Opera House. It declares: "We unhesitatingly say that we, as an anti, do not approve of the shotgun argument indulged in by some over-zealous opponents of the lottery iniquity."²³

²⁰*Ibid.*

²¹The *Louisiana Democrat Weekly*, Alexandria, Louisiana, July 1, 1891.

²²*Ibid.*, July 15, 1891.

²³The *Daily City Item*, New Orleans, Louisiana, July 13, 1891. Other Parish papers attacking Palmer in like fashion were: *The Iberville South*, Plaquemine, Louisiana; the *La Tourche Comet*, Thibodaux, Louisiana; the *Madison Journal*, Tallulah, Louisiana; *The De Soto Democrat*, De Soto, Louisiana; *The Morgan City Review*, Morgan City, Louisiana; *The Pointe Coupee Banner*, New Roads, Louisiana; *The Natchitoches Democratic Review*, Natchitoches, Louisiana; *The Arcadia Sentinel*, Arcadia, Louisiana.

The lottery press left no stone unturned in seeking material with which to embarrass Palmer. The *Daily States* for June 28, 1891, carried an article stating that in 1822 a lottery charter was granted the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans and that the very church in which Palmer was preaching was actually established through a lottery voted by the church membership. Immediately, the *Southwestern Presbyterian*,²⁴ official organization of the Presbyterian church in Louisiana, pointed out that while it was true that the original church built by the First Presbyterian congregation in New Orleans in 1822 was partially paid for by a lottery, the building had been destroyed by fire and therefore was not the church in which Palmer was pastor.

The only New Orleans paper to uphold Palmer was the *Daily New Delta* organized by the anti-lottery forces to champion their cause during the campaign. Palmer's speech in full was carried in the Sunday edition, June 28, of the *Daily New Delta*. The issue of June 29 carried the announcement that copies of the *Daily New Delta* containing the speech of Palmer could be procured at the business office ready for mailing. The following day the *Daily New Delta* commented that "the heavy demand that is being made for last Sunday's *Daily New Delta* containing Dr. Palmer's great speech against lottery is convincing evidence that his remarks have made a profound impression. . . ."²⁵

On July 8, the *Daily New Delta* announced: "Some 20,000 copies of Dr. Palmer's speech were sent out through Louisiana, but the demand is not yet supplied."²⁶

It was the editorial policy of the *Daily New Delta* to employ short, terse statements either praising Palmer or condemning the prolottery. This policy continued for about thirty days. Humor and ridicule were employed frequently.²⁷

Immediately following the delivery of the speech, Palmer was attacked personally by the pro-lottery press. The *Daily City Item* went so far as to question the quality of Palmer's Christianity stating:

²⁴*Southwestern Presbyterian* (New Orleans, 1869-1908), July 16, 1891.

²⁵Editorial in the *Daily New Delta*, New Orleans, June 30, 1891.

²⁶*Ibid.*, July 8, 1891.

²⁷The following examples of these jibes were taken from the *Daily New Delta* between June 26, 1891 and August 1, 1891.

"Every time Dr. Palmer hit a lick Thursday night it raised a welt."

"Judging from the amount of kicking done by the lotterites Dr. Palmer's speech must hurt."

It is therefore with mixed feelings of wonder and regret that I find the Rev. Dr. Palmer lately repudiating the worthy work of a life-time by boldly advocating ideas and measures in direct and violent antagonism to the lessons in the gospel. Such glaring inconsistency not only demands explanation, but warrants all fair-thinking people in doubting and challenging the quality of his Christianity. Is Dr. Palmer a Christian?²⁸

Following the speech, Palmer remained silent on the issue, thus depriving the press of any new material upon which to capitalize. The personal attack upon Palmer by the lottery press continued for about three weeks and then subsided. By out-doing Palmer in the use of the very tactics for which they had condemned him, the lottery forces overplayed their hand. Although the public disagreed with the revolutionary attitude toward the lottery, evinced in Palmer's speech, they were unwilling to question the motives, character, and morality of the most outstanding minister in Louisiana. Thus the attempt of the lottery press to scale and rate Palmer personally, boomeranged.

VI

In conclusion, the facts indicate that the effect of Palmer's speech on the listening audience was near overwhelming. The audience was completely polarized and the will of the speaker prevailed. The extremely favorable audience response may have caused the speaker to over-extend his rhetoric. Palmer seemingly forgot or ignored his invisible audience, which outnumbered many-fold his immediate audience.

"Judging from the contortions that the lotteryites are indulging in, if Dr. Palmer would make just one more speech against their pet gambling monopoly they would go stark raving mad."

"The revulsion in public sentiment in New Orleans created by Dr. Palmer's speech at the Grand Opera House is something wonderful. . . ."

"The influence of Dr. Palmer's speech at the Grand Opera House is being felt in the country Parishes. The lottery's newspapers all over the state have joined in the squeal over it."

The following joke appeared in the *New Delta* for Sunday, July 6, 1891.

Lottery Boss: "What was that?"

Lotteryite: "It was an earthquake, sir."

Lottery Boss: "Thank heavens. I thought Dr. Palmer had made another speech."

²⁸Editorial in the *Daily City Item*, New Orleans, July 13, 1891.

From the standpoint of invention, the speech leaves much to be desired. Analogy, illustration, generalization and biblical illusion were the primary forms of support. Over-statements were not infrequent. The speech abounds in ethical and pathetic proofs; logical proofs were employed sparingly. Although the attitude of the listening audience made the utilization of logical proof unnecessary, it did not excuse Palmer from his obligation to present a strong factual and logical case against the lottery. His failure to assume this burden invited the attack of the press.

For the first time in his thirty-five years as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Palmer was confronted by a hostile, merciless press. There is no evidence to indicate that he made any attempt to defend himself or his speech publicly. He left his pulpit, entered the political arena and spoke his mind on the lottery. Having done so, he returned to his pulpit.

Perhaps the greatest merit of the speech lay in its shocking power. It startled the public into an acute awareness of the lottery issue. Thomas Cary Johnson, Palmer's biographer, declared that the speech was the most powerful utterance on the lottery issue and that it turned the tide in favor of the anti-lottery cause. Certainly, no other speech during the lottery campaign received such widespread attention in the press.

Since Palmer was the most revered and outstanding minister in Louisiana, his bold stand against the lottery was the stroke needed to unite the religious forces throughout the state; Protestant, Catholic, and Jew alike. The severe personal attack of the pro-lottery press against Palmer served to spur the anti-lottery forces into determined action. The extreme methods employed by the lotteryites in their attack indicated that they would stop at nothing to win the rechartering of the company. This display of ruthlessness aided the anti-lotteryites in recruiting hitherto neutral groups.

Regardless of its weaknesses in structure and forms of support, Palmer's speech stands as the most important single speaking effort made during the anti-lottery campaign—a campaign which resulted in the defeat of the lottery in the 1892 general election.

MOLIERE OR MICKEY MOUSE

MAY BURTON

THE TITLES "Moliere or Walt Disney" and "Scapin or Mickey Mouse" would keep creators and creations properly categorized. However, creator and creation in both instances belong in the same grouping under different headings. They all belong in the theatre.

Theatre is an elusive and inclusive term encompassing in its concept that verbal and physical art which presents ideas, actions, and entertainment in an arresting fashion. Theatre may appear in many shapes and styles. It may involve people or puppets or animated cartoons. One shape in which theatre appears to millions of people every hour of every day and which is subject to praise and damnation by critics is television. This particular theatre brings to basement playrooms, home living rooms, and hotel bedrooms adaptations of styles of theatre which society has known for centuries. The players may wear new costumes and speak or sing new lines, but each day across the TV screen there are images of strolling comedians, wandering minstrels, town criers, Sunday orators from Hyde Park, and street vendors singing out the glories of their wares. Also, there are ministers, teachers, symphony orchestras, dancers, puppet shows, and one fairly new member of the theatre world: the animated cartoon. All the arts John Gassner¹ attributes to the theatre and some new elements are included in the possibilities of this theatrical medium: television.

"Possibilities" is the key to any thoughtful consideration of television. This key, "possibilities" opens three areas:

- (1) Possibilities that have been thought but not accomplished.
- (2) Possibilities for improvement of current styles.
- (3) Possibilities to be discovered and explored.

As these areas are considered, more possibilities may become apparent along with physical limitations which discipline their development.

Miss Burton (Ph.D., Florida, 1956) is Assistant Professor in Journalism and TV writer and producer for WUFT at the University of Florida. She was a Fulbright Fellow in France during 1956-1957.

¹John Gassner, *Producing the Play* (2d ed. rev.; New York: The Dryden Press, 1953), Introduction.

To gain more objectivity on the subject of possibilities in educational and cultural television and to search for fresh ideas in the medium, I spent a year in France on a Fulbright scholarship. In Paris I attended lectures and laboratories sponsored by Centre d'Études Radiophoniques, interviewed producers, observed programs in production, participated in experiments, and read reports of other experiments. After thoughtful consideration of these activities and our own, I concluded that in spite of vast organizational differences, telecasters and broadcasters in France and the United States face mutual challenges.

Briefly, this is the set-up in France. There is one big organization owned by the government. Radiodiffusion-Télévision Française is divided into five large working units:

(1) Informational (2) Cultural (3) Educational (4) Children's and (5) Experimental. The fifth in my listing, the experimental, is most like educational broadcasting and telecasting in the U. S. A. All together, these divisions combine efforts to produce the variety of programs seen and heard in any day in France. Program schedules are listed in daily papers. There is also a weekly schedule booklet costing about twelve cents. This publication, *La Semaine Radio-phonique et La Semaine Télévisée*, gives schedules and publicity coverage for individual stars and shows much as *TV Guide* in this country. Since radio is still more popular and more accessible in French homes, a larger portion of *La Semaine* is devoted to radio. A survey of daily program offerings on French television and radio indicates categorical offerings not too dissimilar to our own.² A typical week includes news, children's programs, circus variety programs, old movies, scholarly talks, serious drama, and time listed and labeled as experimental.

A certain amount of experimentation is done in all branches of RTF, but experimentation is the *raison d'être* of Studio Club d'Essai and the Centre d'Études Radiophonique. At Club d'Essai researchers and directors are not regimented by a daily schedule on the air. Sunday afternoon broadcasts do afford air-time for programs, without burdening the staff with continual programming that scarcely allows for creative thinking or experimental exploration. As stated earlier, Studio d'Essai is most like our educational

²During 1956-57, there were daily afternoon broadcasts of American Rock-and-Roll records alongside recorded programs of Negro spirituals and Arabian folk music.

broadcasting station in that it has little money and a multitude of dreams. Also, the only training for people in broadcasting is done through Studio d'Essai.³ 1956-1957 marked the third year of its training program and graduation of the school's first class of apprentices. These students, during three years, had had a large dose of theory on all subjects connected with broadcasting from electronics to psychological studies of attention span and including values of poetry on the air and uses of music with film. Besides their three and a half to four hours of lecture per week, these students had spent afternoon and early evening hours in radio, TV, and photographic laboratories. More advanced students worked closely with staff members in experiments.

"Les experiences" at Club d'Essai are varied in nature. One continuous and major experiment is related to broadcasting but results are being used more often in legitimate theatre. This is Musique Concrète. Headed by Ferre Schaeffer, Musique Concrète research is a separate division of Club d'Essai. Quite a bit of attention is focused on the style of musical sound produced here. It was common when browsing through bookstores to find displays of articles and books by and about M. Schaeffer and the Musique Concrète style philosophy. The results of M. Schaeffer's research can be described briefly as a method of combining sounds from a multitude of sources and electronically scoring these into compositions. This method was employed a few years ago to produce some of the background music for Orson Welles' production of *King Lear*.

Another experiment at Club d'Essai which is more closely related to daily programming and production is Jacques Warrant's work with children's programs for pre-school and in-school uses. M. Warrant, with the staff at Club d'Essai, has studied on-the-air treatments of history, music, and languages. In each case, there have been careful studies of reactions by children in control groups. Music and language are currently taught on RTF, but personnel at Club d'Essai is interested in improving methods.

Work in adult education has been promoted by the research staff in encouraging and organizing listening and viewing clubs in rural areas of France. For purely economic reasons, radio and TV are

³"Club d'Essai," an article by Stanley T. Donner in *The Journal of The AERT* (May, 1956) discusses their activities in greater detail than I have done in this paper.

not as available to French families as they are to American. However, through careful planning and organization, many communities have central meeting places for their teleclubs. Here they can enjoy theatre and music from the cities and benefit from agricultural training programs planned for them.

"Is there a better way to do it?" seems to be the question asked by Club d'Essai staff members in even the simplest of productions. I was one of three guinea pigs for an experiment in interviewing. A group of eight people, three of us Americans, sat around a table and conversed, with questions moving from the French participants to the Americans. We conversed for benefit of a tape recorder for one hour and five minutes. Later, on several Sunday afternoons, five minute interviews with each of the Americans were broadcast. These were followed by interviews with French people in contrast or parallel to the topics discussed in the first interviews with the American guests.

One of the most exciting experiments to me, because it involved travelling to a new section of France and because it utilized elements I would never have thought of combining, was Radio dell'Arte. This project combined elements of psychodrama and improvisation. Working from a scenario, a group of actors improvised a short drama in the actual locale of the story. The director of the program, M. Herzog, felt that this production was richer in colloquial speech and idiom, and more humanly appealing than improvisations which had been done in studios.

While a majority of my research time was spent with the Club d'Essai, I did investigate the other divisions of RTF. Programs labeled as "Education" were often a disappointment to me. Here, radio and TV were used only as transmitting tools. Perhaps that is how they should be used, but I had expected some flair of French imagination in putting the classroom on the air.

Classical theatre on the air was a delight and a help in learning the French language. Here again, the medium, radio, was used to transmit just what was going on. In TV, there were more specially written dramas, re-runs of movies, variety programs, and circuses which parallel the daily TV fare in the U.S. Twice a month, an operetta was staged for a live theatre audience and three television cameras. By no standards could these productions be called flawless, but they were enjoyable. Offenbach's music survived a few

out-of-step dances and a bit of ham in character portrayal and came through as light-hearted entertainment.

Children's programs on TV seemed actually to be for children. Fewer hours of air-time were devoted to children's programming, but these hours seemed more exclusively planned with children in mind. On Thursday afternoons, from the Cognac-Jay studio, children's time included stories—simply told and with simple animations, with no violence and with nothing fantastic! There were animations, but not cartoons. Animated drawings illustrated stories and supplemented narration. In addition to stories, there were children's newscasts. The Mickey Mouse Club on American TV also has children's newscasts altogether different in concept from the French newscasts. On the Mickey Mouse Club, children report news of the adult world. In the French newscasts I saw, children themselves were the news. Children's activities in France and other countries of Europe were reported once a week, on film. Puppet shows were also a part of children's time on French TV. One program, which does not classify in any of these divisions, is more vivid in memory than all others. This program combined music, Fifteenth Century French poetry, and film clips of winter scenes in Paris parks. In relating nearby actuality and classical poetry, the medium of television reached an imaginative and artistic height for children and adults.

During ten months observance, this participant came to believe that a dichotomy exists in French broadcasting. On the one hand producers and writers evidence great interest and excitement in favor of experimentation; equal conversational enthusiasm is demonstrated for artistic productions. Yet, on the other hand, seldom do programs there reach the height of the simple and significant program of winter and music and poetry described in the previous paragraph.

After ten months absence, one takes a more objective view of American educational radio and TV and discovers that the same dichotomy exists on this side of the Atlantic! Our dreams and schemes might be described by a French researcher as "*magnifique*" and "*formidable*" but many of our actual programs as "*très ordinaire*."

French broadcasting and telecasting theory, then, when contrasted with our own commercial broadcasting, follows a pattern of (1)

more transmission of the classics in established style, (2) more esthetic aims in experimentation, (3) theoretically less concern with communication, and (4) less emphasis on programming to an audience of individuals; while our ady-to-day broadcasting fare demonstrates (1) more concern with glamour, (2) more interest in showmanship. When watching a TV screen in France, one receives a low-pressure invitation to watch. When viewing TV in the United States, there is usually a high-pressure command to watch.

In our educational broadcasting and telecasting, one can find samples of programs similar to educational programs available in France and samples of programs similar to commercial offerings. We sometimes imitate our commercial cousins and we sometimes simply transmit our classrooms to the public. There are times and circumstances when the later is the service needed in a community and in such an event it certainly should be done. But, we, like the French often talk one way and work another.

The choice suggested in the title of this paper is one made consciously or unconsciously by broadcasters on both sides of the Atlantic, and the choice should not be the same. Utilizing the definition of theatre given earlier and applying it to mechanical theatres of radio and television, it is clear that ideas, action, and entertainment have a legitimate place when presented in an arresting fashion. But what portion belongs to each of them? There is no perfect pattern of program balance and scheduling that suits Gai Paris, the south of France, New York City, and the plains of the midwest. Balance in types of programs is best achieved when governed by the needs of the audience. When, through conferences and surveys needs are determined, then through planning and experimentation with possibilities they can be supplied; each in an appropriate style and scheduled together in appropriate balance.

The conclusion in the matter of choice is that whether owned and operated under a state franchise, by private enterprise, or by community interests, the mechanical theatre faces a daily question of balance. The choice is not one of selecting the cartoons or the classics, but the needed quantity of each. How MUCH Moliere and how MUCH Mickey Mouse?

DEBATING AS CRITICAL DELIBERATION

DOUGLAS EHNINGER

I

CERTAINLY, I need not remind this audience of the long and proud history of debating. By the same token, however, I need hardly remind you that within recent decades debating, both as an academic exercise and as a mode of argumentative deliberation, has found itself on the defensive. Today, instead of enjoying unqualified public endorsement, it bears the unaccustomed burden of explanation and apology.

Why is debating in such a posture? In large part, of course, it is because certain of its devotees seemingly cannot refrain from unwise and unfair practices. As I believe and shall attempt to demonstrate in this paper, however, there is also another reason which has been little noticed, and, to my knowledge, never before formally discussed. It is this: We teachers of speech, aided and abetted by our colleagues in education and the social sciences, habitually characterize the debate process in an idiom which automatically puts it on the defensive, while we seldom speak an alternative idiom, which, with no less claim to validity, presents a much more favorable picture of the nature and purpose of debating.

The first of these idioms emerges from what we generally refer to as the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy; the second is based upon the proposition that debating is a mode of critical deliberation. Let us consider them in order.

II

Since the influence of John Dewey made itself felt on our profession during the twenties and early thirties the prevailing fashion has been to distinguish between the method by which conclusions or decisions are derived and the method by which they are communicated to others. The first we describe as the process of "inquiry," and so far as argumentative deliberation is concerned de-

Mr. Ehninger (Ph.D., Ohio State University, 1949) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Florida.

clare it is the special province of "discussion"; the second, we say, is a species of advocacy and is articulated in the procedure called "debate."

By some writers these two processes of inquiry and advocacy are treated as independent thought movements. By others they are regarded as distinguishable points or stages on a continuum, along which all modes of deliberation may be ranged. For our present purpose, it is immaterial which view is favored. In either case, what emerges is a basic formulation characterizing debate as a trial of strength between mutually exclusive conclusions or "outcomes of thought." Debate appears as a vehicle for decision through forced choice—a technique men resort to when they are impelled to select between irreconcilable alternatives which were themselves derived by methods and procedures foreign to the debate process.

As those familiar with the literature will know, this formulation has at least four important corollaries. (1) Debate is of the genre of persuasion, rather than investigation. (2) Debate takes over where inquiry leaves off or is inapplicable. (3) The parties to a debate have their minds irrevocably fixed in advance of the argument. (4) The characteristic thought pattern employed in debate is rationalistic or deductive—the adducing of reasons to support and prove prior premises.

Why does this formulation put the debate process on the defensive?

First, I should suggest, stemming from each of the corollaries are one or more widely accepted implications or inferences, which combine to present debate in a distinctly unfavorable light. As commonly held, these implications run something as follows: (1) Because debate is of the genre of persuasion, its natural affinities are those uncritical modes of speaking and writing by which men attempt to win agreement through some method other than a careful and objective weighing of the evidence. (2) Because it takes over where inquiry leaves off or is inapplicable, it is a court of second choice—something to fall back upon when a preferred method fails. (3) Because the contending parties enter a debate with their minds set, the ensuing argument is in the nature of a fight or struggle. Debate's natural modes are compulsion and force; its natural atmosphere, that of contention and conflict. (4) Because the basic thought pattern used in debate is rationalistic

or deductive, debate is rigid, dogmatic, and uncreative. The reasoning done by the debater has a pre-determined end. It is calculated or "intentional."

The second reason the formulation based upon the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy puts debating on the defensive is that it associates debate with certain processes and values which in our culture are generally, and indeed quite properly, held suspect. "Persuasion," "fixed belief," "rationalistic," "deductive," "fight," "compulsion," "force," "conflict," "rigid," "uncreative"—these terms which I have employed in stating the foregoing inferences are not peculiar to my vocabulary. They are among the words most commonly used—words which, in fact, it would be almost impossible to avoid—in describing the view of debate that emerges from the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy. And they are, without exception, of course, words that bear a stigma.

In proportion as these terms and their cognates accurately describe this view of the debate process, while, on the other hand, such generally approved terms as "suspended judgment," "constructive thinking," "scientific method," and the like, properly describe the method of inquiry, an evaluation of the social and ethical desirability of debating is, in a very real sense, taken out of our hands, and is made for us rather than by us. Indeed, in a culture such as ours, with its fears of the methods of propaganda and persuasion and the disapprovals rightly placed on conflict, compulsion, and the power of special interests, a judgment is implicit in the approach itself. By the very act of distinguishing between inquiry and advocacy we align the latter with suspect methods and values, and thus automatically put debate on the defensive.

A third reason accounting for the unfavorable position of debate under the dominance of this dichotomy is that the formulation thus provided leaves unspoken or insufficiently emphasized many of debate's most fundamental philosophical assumptions and agreements. To debate is to renounce the use of any form of direct force or of subtle pressure as a means for settling differences. To debate is to agree to put one's deep convictions and cherished ideals to the test, and to be willing to abide by the decision of another concerning them. To debate is to agree to have one's views subjected to the close scrutiny and concentrated attack of someone who openly opposes them—someone who is as well informed on the subject

as is the advocate himself. To debate is to agree to give an opponent as much time to present his case as you have to present yours. To debate is to contract to answer arguments and questions on the spot, as they are fired in the heat of the moment. To debate is to enter into a gentleman's agreement to present for the consideration of judge and opponent alike a full account of the evidence and reasoning upon which one's view is based—to lay these upon the table for public examination and analysis. In this sense, to debate is to speak as directly as possible to man's reason, rather than appeal to his prejudices or emotions.

These, certainly, are among the fundamental propositions and agreements upon which the rationale of debate is predicated—propositions and agreements of which we, as teachers of speech and as citizens in a democratic society, are well aware, and the importance of which we all recognize. Yet they either go unmentioned or are relegated to a place of less than first importance when we view debate in the terms now being considered.

The fourth and final reason a philosophy of debating based upon the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy puts the debate process on the defensive is that it does not properly differentiate the debater from other advocates and from the methods and ethics of advocacy in general. As the propositions and agreements just outlined indicate, the debater is clearly an advocate of a very rare and unusual sort—one who may, in fact, be regarded as unique. Who else among his fellow advocates is willing to subscribe to the conditions and terms he freely accepts? Do statesmen in advancing and defending the interests of nations openly renounce all recourse to force, let alone to the use of subtle pressures and covert agreements? Do sectarians and fanatics even allow their beliefs and creeds be put to the test? What propagandist would agree to have his appeals examined by an equally well-informed opponent, and contract to answer all of his questions and objections on the spot? What advertiser would buy his competitor equal time and space, and ask that judgment be suspended until both sides had been fully heard? What manipulator of public opinion would invite a full inspection of his methods by a trained critic? Yet the debater does all of these things, and more, when he enters an argument—things which because they are unspoken under the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy contribute to putting the debate process on the defensive.

III

If, then, this is, as I believe, a fair statement of the view of debate which emerges from the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy, and an account of some of the reasons why such a view puts debating on the defensive, let us now turn to a consideration of the second of the idioms mentioned at the outset—that which speaks of debate as a mode of critical deliberation. What is the nature of this idiom and why does it tend to present debate in a more favorable light? In this case our formulation runs along lines something like these.

As individuals we may arrive at our personal beliefs and choices in one of two ways: critically, upon the basis of adequate evidence and sound inference; or uncritically, as a result of desire, superstition, custom, or impulse. So may a group or an entire society shape its collective beliefs and make its collective choices in a critical or uncritical fashion. It may believe that progressive education is bad and installment buying good; it may prefer war to economic strangulation; it may endorse Candidate A over Candidate B either because it has deliberated these beliefs and choices critically or because it has been swept by the uncritical forces of propaganda, suggestion, and mass persuasion.

Men have long been convinced that beliefs and choices based upon critical thought and deliberation are to be preferred not only in the life of the individual but in that of the group and of society, as well. Hence, they have attempted to discover the various principles and conditions upon which critical belief and choice depend, and to apply these by constructing specific tools or instruments designed to help us think critically in the different areas where beliefs and choices are required. The generalized or abstract criteria, terms, conditions, and movements of critical thought they have stated and systematized in the discipline of logic. For the application of these elements in arriving at correct and useful beliefs concerning man and his physical environment, they have developed and refined the remarkable tool we call scientific method. For applying the elements of critical thought to the formation of correct beliefs regarding the nature of society past and present, they have developed the investigatory methods of the social sciences and of history. Articulating these critical elements in the areas of the arts, they have constructed great systems of aesthetics; in the areas

of personal choice and conduct, great systems of ethics. And to provide groups and societies with methods by which these same criteria may be used to settle differences among men and to arrive at collective choices and decisions they have devised the processes of critical deliberation—namely, discussion and debate.

Although the foregoing tools differ in approach and method, their differences in these respects are less significant than the fact that in purpose and philosophy they are strikingly alike. All are carefully conceived structures or organizational patterns, designed to enable us to use the basic elements of critical thinking in the forming of beliefs and the making of choices. A deep and persistent respect for facts, a realization of the importance of clear and stable terms, obedience to the laws of valid inference, demand for proof over assertion, for objectivity over emotion or prejudice, for suspended judgment over impulse, dedication to the basic proposition that conclusions must accord with the evidence, that belief must be subjected to the searching tests of reason—these, all of the foregoing processes and methods have in common. Moreover, in this respect they are not only tools of a kind, but they are to be distinguished from all other methods for settling differences and for arriving at beliefs or choices. They are distinctive because they alone are consciously critical; because they alone demand the persistent application of logic to our thought processes; because they alone earnestly endeavor to employ only thinking that has been thought about long and searchingly, that has over the centuries been tempered and fashioned into the most sensitive and reliable mental tool man can devise.

Recognizing, then, the common purpose and nature of the various instruments which seek to apply the principles and methods of critical thinking in arriving at beliefs and choices, and recognizing that argumentative deliberation, in its current popular forms of debate and discussion properly belongs among them, let us now further say how under this view debate itself may be defined. Our definition might, I believe, run something like this: Debate is that mode of argumentative deliberation which has for its purpose enabling men to proceed critically in those situations where, confronted with mutually exclusive alternatives, they think it wise to appeal beyond themselves for arbitration and judgment. And debate is critical, not only because in the courtroom and legislative assem-

bly long experience has evolved elaborate codes of rules and procedures to keep it so, but also because the very method of debate has a built-in governor or control in the privilege and responsibility of every debater to point out instances where his opponent violates the criteria and principles of critical thought and deliberation.

This, of course, is not to say that the method may not be abused or so ineptly practiced that the internal control of criticalness fails to function effectively. But the same weakness is present in any instrument of critical thought or deliberation; and in all cases the fault is a human one. It lies in the user and not in the instrument itself. Properly employed—that is, employed so that all of the potentialities inherent in its rationale have full play—debate is a critical instrument because its very method is synonymous with criticalness.

IV

Why this alternative formulation tends to present the debate process in a more favorable light should already be evident. To see the matter even more clearly, however, let us trace out its corollaries and their implications. These, it will be seen, stand in marked contrast with their counterparts stemming from the inquiry-advocacy view.

Our new corollaries may be stated as follows. (1) Debate is of the genre of investigation, not of persuasion. As a tool designed to apply the principles and methods of critical thought, it is an instrument for helping men arrive at correct beliefs and valid choices. A proposition for debate, properly regarded, is a hypothesis. The debate itself is the rational elaborate that tests this assertion. (2) The natural affinities of debate are scientific method and the other tool of critical thinking and deliberation. Propaganda, suggestion, mass persuasion—all methods that attempt to by-pass or short-circuit the reflective process—these are its natural opposites. (3) Debate is not a species of conflict but of co-operation. Debaters are co-workers in the task of finding correct beliefs and decisions. They co-operate in the process of submitting a proposition to rigorous tests. (4) In the sense that the proposition is a hypothesis, rather than a final and inevitable dictum, debaters have their minds fixed, but only to a degree. They believe firmly enough to be willing to go on public record, but not so firmly that they are unwilling to put their convictions to a severe test and to abide by the decision of another concerning them.

The implications, in turn, are these: (1) Investigation and inquiry are broader than discovery—the process of moving from the unknown to the known. They involve truth testing—the examination of what we think we already know or what already appears to have been established. Investigation ceases only when a matter has been closed and sealed finally and forever by all men. (2) Criticalness is not the exclusive property of any one method or procedure of investigation. Reflection and deliberation are not critical simply because they follow the inductive method of science, and uncritical simply because they depart from it. Criticalness is essentially an attitude, a state of mind, rather than a process or technique. (3) Co-operation may permit of conflict within its structure, and yet not lose its essential nature. As even the staunchest discussionists often assert, the conflict of ideas lies at the heart of the co-operative group thinking process. (4) To view debate purely as an exercise in advocacy and hence to emphasize the element of conflict, is to focus on only a part of the whole—on the end and role of one of the participants, rather than on the entire debate process. This has for its purpose arriving at correct belief and choice through the co-operative examination of alternatives. (5) The crucial distinction of which we should always be mindful is not between argumentative deliberation aimed at implementing discovery and argumentative deliberation aimed at decision. It is between arriving at group beliefs and choices by methods that are critical and by methods that are not critical—by weight of evidence, on the one hand, and superstition, guess, prejudice, personal feelings, and the like, on the other. It is these latter methods that are to be avoided because in the long run they are neither useful nor socially productive.

V

In presenting these alternative views of the nature of the debate process and tracing the corollaries and implications of each, it has not been my purpose to impugn the validity of the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy. Nor have I intended to suggest that the view of debating which emerges from it is in all respects false and misleading, while the view which holds debate to be a mode of critical deliberation has a premium on validity and completeness.

The fact of the matter is that in talking about an artificial con-

struct such as debate no language has a prior claim on validity. Indeed, the construct itself is to a very considerable degree actually created by the language. Debate is what we say it is; it is shaped and designated by us out of the terms and syntax of the idiom we are accustomed to apply to it. Nor is any single language rich and flexible enough to express accurately and fully so complex and many-faceted a phenomenon as debating. Described in one language, debate has this particular sort of appearance; described in another language, it takes on quite a different mien. No single language can exhaust its possibilities. There always remains more to be said, if we will but change idioms. Not to realize this is to overlook the semanticists' principle of Etc.

The dangers, therefore, are two: first, to assume that one formulation or idiom is the only valid one; and second, to assume that this idiom says all there is to say about the debate process. Applied specifically to our situation today, the danger is that in speaking the language of the inquiry-advocacy dichotomy we shall forget the even more fundamental and primitive language of debating as critical deliberation. My purpose, rather than to criticize either idiom, has been to call attention to this danger, and to suggest that we, as teachers of speech, have it in our control to do something about the situation.

After all, is not the language of debating as critical deliberation the one we learned in our childhood, and is it not the one which for our own salvation in a bleak and uncertain world, it is important for us to talk today? The difference between thought and deliberation that are critical and thought and deliberation that are not; the importance of talking it out rather than fighting it out; the doctrine that debaters are actually co-workers in an earnest search for truth and justice; the fact that in its respect for evidence, in its dedication to the proposition that belief must be subjected to the searching tests of reason, debate is a close relative of scientific method, rather than its natural opposite—are not these the basic characteristics of the debate process about which we should seize every opportunity to talk? The choice clearly lies with us. If we as teachers of speech were increasingly to use this language and were to speak less frequently of debate in the language of "compulsion," "fight," "intentional reasoning," "propaganda," and the like, we could, I believe, materially contribute to taking it out of its present position of defense and apology.

GENERAL SEMANTICS AND SPEECH CORRECTION

SARA M. IVEY

INTRODUCTION

THIS PAPER is not meant to be a complete evaluation of general semantics as applied to speech correction, but rather a report of the examination of the literature involving the application of the principles of general semantics to speech correction. It was assumed that a survey of the literature would enable the writer to evaluate the impact of general semantics on speech correction and to comment on its usefulness as a tool.

To become involved with the term *semantics* is to become involved with the "what-it-is-not" statement. The writer found numerous interesting classifications such as historical semantics; semantics of communication—which subsums three coordinate areas, philosophic semantics, cultural semantics, and scientific semantics; linguistic semantics—which subsums three areas, literary semantics, legal and political semantics, and psychological semantics.¹ John B. Newman writes:

As the study of the dynamics of meaning in language, semantics applies to everything in which language is a factor, -an area, to say the least, of considerable range and scope. Obviously then, the term "semantics" needs to be specific in order that its own usage be meaningful.²

This paper is concerned with one aspect of semantics, general semantics.

The term *general semantics* is used here as it is defined by Korzybski.

General Semantics is not any 'philosophy' or 'psychology' or 'logic', in the ordinary sense. It is a new extensional discipline which explains and trains us to use our nervous system most efficiently. It is not a medical science, but like bacteriology, it is indispensable for

Miss Ivey (Ph.D., Louisiana State University, 1951) is Professor of Speech and Director of the Speech and Hearing Clinic at the University of Arkansas.

¹John B. Newman, "The Area of Semantics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XLIII (April, 1957), 159-162.

²*Ibid.*, 164.

medicine in general, and for psychiatry, mental hygiene, and education in particular. In brief, it is the formulation of a new non-Aristotelian system of orientation which affects every branch of science and life. The separate issues involved are not entirely new; their methodological formulation as a system is workable, teachable and so elementary that it can be applied by children, is entirely new.³

Wendell Johnson modifies the term accordingly:

By "science" we refer generally to the study of fact-fact relations. By "logic" we refer generally to the study of word-word relations. By "General Semantics" I mean to refer, in the main, to the study of word-fact relations.⁴

A more specific explanation of the term is given by Raymond Carhart.

Stated concisely, General Semantics may be classified as a method of facilitating, correcting, restoring, etc. one's adjustment to life. It has its origins in efforts to determine why men often fail so miserably in personal and social affairs and yet succeed so brilliantly in technological and scientific efforts.⁵

The term *speech correction* will be considered to mean speech therapy and the professional training of speech therapists.

CONTROVERSY BETWEEN SPEECH AND GENERAL SEMANTICS

A preliminary review of the literature on speech denotes that there has been controversy as to the possibility, as well as to the value, of the application of the principles of general semantics in such areas as speech education, public speaking, rhetoric and debate. Jeannette Anderson (1943) made these suggestions concerning general semantics:

"I should like to suggest that this system may not be the scientific panacea it claims to be, that it may not be applicable to speech education; and that even if it were both scientific and applicable to our field, it would still be undesirable as a rationale in the teaching of speech."⁶

³Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity* (Lancaster, 1941), 6.

⁴Wendell Johnson, "Language and Speech Hygiene," *General Semantics Monographs*, I (March 1939), 1.

⁵Raymond Carhart, "A Speech Teacher Looks at General Semantics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXVIII (October 1942), 333.

⁶Jeannette Anderson, "A Critique of General Semantics," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXIX (April, 1943), 188.

Irving Lee wrote: "General Semantics could make a contribution to a linguistic analysis of rhetoric."⁷ Carhart makes these conclusions: "General Semantics can contribute to speech theory and practice. The exact nature and degree of this contribution is not yet worked out."⁸ Glenn R. Capp states that: "If the methodology of general semantics is considered as complementary rather than antagonistic to the procedures of the debater, he may utilize such procedures in making his evaluation more adequate. Training in general semantics should make for improved debating."⁹

In the area of speech correction the literature revealed no evidence of controversial viewpoints and little evidence of its application. The limited instance of references in the literature, thus, has limited the intended scope of this paper. The bulk of the writing has been done by two writers, Dr. Wendell Johnson and Dr. Ollie Backus. These two exponents have experimented rather extensively in the application of its principles.

APPLICATION OF GENERAL SEMANTICS TO SPEECH CORRECTION

Recently Professor Johnson wrote:

I have used what I know of general semantics and related things in my clinical work with stutterers, and, I feel to good advantage. I use it in my teaching generally, trying generally to help students to become able to talk meaningfully and intelligently about the talking they do, to become aware of the sorts of thinking their language does for them, and in all ways possible helping them to become increasingly conscious of this abstracting as a major factor in what they "know" and "think" and "feel" and "believe," etc., etc. I consider the cultivation of this sort of awareness to be basic to any education worthy of the name.¹⁰

Reflection of these statements can be found specifically in his writings, especially, *Stuttering in Children and Adults*, *Your Most Enchanted Listener*, *Speech Handicapped School Children*, "Language and Speech Hygiene," in the *General Semantics Monograph*,

⁷Irving Lee, "General Semantics and Public Speaking," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXVI (December, 1940), 598.

⁸Carhart, *op. cit.*, 337.

⁹Glenn R. Capp, "General Semantics for the Debater," *The Southern Speech Journal*, XIX (May, 1954), 303.

¹⁰Letter to the writer, 1958.

Handbook of Speech Pathology edited by Travis, and several articles in the ETC journal. Although Dr. Johnson makes some modification of the techniques and devices suggested by Korzybski, in general, he works toward the training of a consciousness of abstracting, using the structural differential as a visual aid. In brief, the structural differential refers to a diagram that presents the levels of abstracting, sub-microscopic being level 1, microscopic, level 2, macroscopic, level 3, label or descriptive statement, 4, inference, 5 etc.

Dr. Backus in recent correspondence writes,

The article on non-identity in group therapy is the only one where I set out specifically to talk in terms of the principles of general semantics. However, I think it is evident in every article that I have written since that time (1951) that I am applying those principles and certainly we are here in the speech clinic. I believe you would see evidence of this particularly in the chapter I wrote in Travis' *Handbook*.¹¹

In this chapter entitled "Group Structure in Speech Therapy," Dr. Backus presents a program of therapy that, "constitutes a cross-sectional view, at one point in a continual process of change, which presents an attempt to make speech therapy consistent with modern conception of the science of man."¹² According to Dr. Backus, "the theoretical foundation for this program of therapy has been influenced by field theory, (Lewin 1935, 1936, 1951), general semantics (Korzybski, 1933; Hayakawa, 1948; Johnson, 1946; Lee, 1941; Rapoport, 1950), interpersonal theory (Sullivan, 1947, 1952; Mullahy, 1949; Horney, 1937, 1939, 1942, 1945, 1950; Fromm, 1941, 1947), the theory of symbolic transformation transformation (Langer, 1951), and client-centered theory of therapy (Rogers, 1950)."¹³ This is an indication that the culmination of the results in therapy was not brought about by the application of the principles of general semantics alone. Dr. Backus conceives of the principles of general semantics as being one of the tools that may be used for improving interpersonal relationships. The explanation is as follows:

¹¹Letter to the writer, 1958.

¹²Edward Lee Travis, editor, *Handbook of Speech Pathology* (New York, 1957) 1062.

¹³*Ibid.*, 1029.

... the scientific principles of non-allness, many-point scale, or the map-like nature of language, are utilized on the spot in a particular situation, and it is here that clients grasp their meaning "feel-wise" as tools. It occurs to parents, for instance, that they have violated the principle "no two things are the same" when they keep comparing one child adversely with a sibling or cousin, and that the consequence has a great increase in pressure both in the child and the parent.¹⁴

As to its general impact on the writing in speech correction, the literature bears evidence of the use of the principles of extensionalization devices, such as quotes, underlining, hyphens, indexing, dating and using etc. One is aware of the effort to avoid the non-allness attitude in statements, to recognize that words are man made and not facts. All of these devices are used in an effort to make the material more understandable and acceptable. As an example, one might examine Simon's chapter on "The Development of Speech" in *The Handbook of Speech Pathology*.

When we consider approaches or techniques in speech therapy, we think in terms of goals or objectives. What goals were sought and what goals were obtained? Both Johnson and Backus have seemingly obtained the goals to which they aspired. From his various research studies in stuttering, Johnson has concluded: "that it is as a listener, a perceiver, an evaluator, quite as much as—probably, in fact, far more than—a speaker that the person who stutters is to be treated."¹⁵ Therefore, he feels that in the treatment of stuttering the principles of general semantics have been used advantageously.

Also, Dr. Backus states:

As the concept of therapy has changed from that of teaching the "child to talk" to that of helping the child remove barriers to learning, the goals have been changed and hence the procedures. What is done now is directed not so much toward progress in speech while the child is in the clinic, but toward progress in removing barriers so that the child will get in condition to do his own growing, wherever he may be—in the clinic, or at home. Experimentation has shown that children almost invariably have improved markedly during three-to-six-months periods between programs of therapy.¹⁶

If the goals in speech therapy be considered that of helping the child or adult stutterer to stop stuttering, the adult with a nasal,

¹⁴Travis, *op. cit.*, 1058.

¹⁵Johnson, *op. cit.*

¹⁶Travis, *op. cit.*, 1042.

infantile voice to have a non-nasal, adult voice, the child or adult with defective [s] [r] [l] sounds to say them correctly, the brain-injured child with aphasia-like tendencies to learn to speak, etc.—the writer found no evidence that they were being accomplished by using only the principles of general semantics.

ROLE OF GENERAL SEMANTICS IN RELATION TO SPEECH CORRECTION

But what, then, is the role of general semantics in speech correction? It has been found that the general semantic approach makes for a better understanding of the person with a speech defect. Bryngelson found: "If you can for the moment become divorced from the traditional, conventional, or textbook definition of speech as a tool or a form of expression and consider it as a *symbolic formulation of an inner emotional state* or personal evaluation which operates and in turn reacts to it, the relationship between speech defect and the person who has it can be more clearly appreciated."¹⁷

In our professional training of speech therapists it may be assumed that we are interested in helping the therapist to understand the person with the defect as well as to gain an understanding of himself, aside from giving him basic information concerning all aspects of growth and development, physiological background, neurological background, etc. Those of us who have experimented, even though slightly, with word-fact relations find that students become more flexible in their thinking, better listeners, better observers. This may in turn make for a better understanding of the people with speech problems and a better understanding of themselves.

Both Johnson and Backus have found general semantics a useful tool in improving interpersonal relationships. Current writing and current practice, according to Van Riper, indicate that stuttering as a disorder of communication rather than of speech, always involves a disturbance in interpersonal relationships. It is possible that more experimentation is needed here.

In 1952, Dr. Irving Lee made several predictions concerning general semantics in relation to areas of speech. His comments

¹⁷Bryng Bryngelson, "Personal Counseling and the Speech Clinic," *Journal of Speech and Hearing Disorders*, III (March, 1948), 13.

concerning speech correction were: "The clinical areas in speech may get help in the synthesis and reformulation of divergent theories and some refinement in clinician's tactics of listening and diagnosis."¹⁸ It is possible that we should heed these suggestions.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has been concerned with a preliminary examination of the literature related to general semantics and speech correction. The following conclusions may be considered:

1. Very little application has been made of the principles of General Semantics in speech therapy.
2. Dr. Johnson and Dr. Backus have experimented rather extensively. Their written reports indicate therapeutic usefulness.
3. Evidence of the use of the principles of General Semantics in writing can be realized by reading the literature in the areas of speech correction.
4. The goals in speech correction may determine its usefulness as a tool.
5. Its application in teaching may give a better understanding of the person with a speech defect.
6. It may be used as a tool for improving interpersonal relationships.
7. Recognition and application of it, even if, in part, may make us better teachers.
8. Those involved with speech correction should understand the basic principles of General Semantics.

Finally, the writer believes that the current limited literature does not give an accurate estimation or evaluation of the impact of general semantics on speech correction. She also feels that more experimentation in its application is necessary to ascertain its usefulness as a tool.

¹⁸Irving J. Lee, "General Semantics," *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, XXXVIII (February, 1952), 12.

ROBERT BARNWELL RHETT: DISUNIONIST HEIR OF CALHOUN, 1850-1852

H. HARDY PERRITT

INTRODUCTION

THE DEATH OF John Caldwell Calhoun was announced in the United States Senate on April 1, 1850. According to James M. Mason, a bedside companion, Calhoun had declared shortly before his death; "The Union is doomed to dissolution, there is no mistaking the signs. . . . The mode by which it will be done is not so clear; it may be brought about in a manner that none now foresee. But the probability is, it will explode in a Presidential election."¹

With Calhoun's full knowledge and approval a convention of the state of Mississippi had sent out a call in August, 1849, for a convention of all the slave-holding states to meet in June, 1850. Before the convention could meet, however, several events important to the South and to the nation had occurred. Henry Clay had proposed his compromise measures in the Senate. Calhoun's last great speech had been read for him, on March 4, 1850 by James M. Mason of Virginia. Daniel Webster had delivered his famous Seventh of March speech in reply. And, perhaps most significant to the South, Calhoun had died.

With the Clay and Douglas compromise measures still being debated in Congress, the Southern Convention attended by delegates from nine states met in Nashville, Tennessee. Robert Barnwell Rhett, a delegate from Colleton District, South Carolina, wrote the convention's "Address to the People of the Southern States," in which he strongly suggested Southern secession. After adopting measures condemning the compromise measures and endorsing extension of the Missouri Compromise Line, the convention

Mr. Perritt (Ph.D., Florida, 1954) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Alabama. Mr. Perritt arranged the program of the Southern Speech Association convention in memory of Dallas Dickey and aided in the preparation of the several papers for printing.

¹Virginia Mason, *The Public Life and Diplomatic Correspondence of James M. Mason* (New York, 1906), pp. 72-73.

adjourned to meet again six weeks after the end of the current session of Congress.²

THE HIBERNIAN HALL SPEECH

Back in Charleston nine days later Rhett, who as a member of the Legislature (1828-33), Attorney-General (1833-36), and member of Congress (1837-49) had repeatedly threatened "resistance,"³ made his first public declaration unequivocally favoring disunion. In a speech at Hibernian Hall, on July 21, he argued: "To maintain the Union, is to acquiesce in the dissolution of the Constitution; and to maintain the Constitution we must dissolve the Union; to afford the only chance of its restoration. . . ." Rhett anticipated violent reaction: "But let it be, that I am a Traitor. The word has no terrors for me. . . . I have been born of traitors, but thank God they have ever been traitors in the working cause of liberty, fighting against tyranny and oppression. Such treason will ever be mine whilst true to my lineage'. Throughout the low country of South Carolina Rhett was hailed as a Patrick Henry and many Fourth of July toasts were drunk to his courageous leadership. Dinners were held in his honor and St. Helena Island awarded him a flag bearing the inscription "Oh that we were all such traitors."⁴ The Washington *Intelligencer* warned that Rhett was urging the people of South Carolina "on to their ruin."⁵ Henry Clay, speaking in the Senate on July 22, declared that if Rhett "follows up that declaration by corresponding overt actions, he will be a traitor, and I hope he will meet the fate of a traitor." There

²Dallas Tabor Herndon, "The Nashville Convention of 1850," *Transactions of the Alabama Historical Society*, V (1904), 216. Benjamin F. Perry, *Reminiscences of Public Men* (Philadelphia, 1883), p. 134, recalled concerning Rhett's authorship of the address: "I heard my friend Henry C. Young, Esq., who stayed in the same room with Mr. Rhett, whilst attending the convention, say that this address was written on the spur of the occasion, and he was amazed at the rapidity with which Mr. Rhett wrote it. I had supposed it was carefully prepared at home and taken with him to the convention."

³See H. Hardy Perritt, "Robert Barnwell Rhett: Prophet of Resistance, 1828-1834," *The Southern Speech Journal*, XXI (Winter, 1955), 103-119.

⁴Charleston *Daily Mercury*, July-Aug., 1850. Charleston *Daily Courier*, July 20, 1850.

⁵Washington *National Intelligencer*, July 25, 1850.

was "great applause in the galleries, with difficulty suppressed by the Chair."⁶

Subsequently, disunion meetings were held all over the South. The climax of the campaign was supposed to be a meeting, on August 22, at Macon, Georgia, where Rhett for the first time in his life was invited to address an audience outside of Carolina. Estimates of the number in attendance ranged from 800 to 15,000.⁷ "The God-like Rhett and his adjutant, Yancey, preached most eloquently in behalf of treason. . . ."⁸ While Rhett and others continued to agitate for secession in their home states, the campaign began to bog down in all except South Carolina with the passage of the compromise measures in September, 1850. The second meeting at Nashville, attended by only seven states, was a fiasco; and elections in Georgia resulted in "a union majority greater than any party had ever rolled up in the history of the state."⁹

THE EULOGY ON CALHOUN

On November 28, two days after the election in Georgia, Rhett delivered a eulogy on Calhoun to the South Carolina Legislature. As an obvious part of the campaign to elect Rhett to Calhoun's seat in the Senate, Governor Seabrook had issued the invitation to Rhett on April 11. The *Mercury* considered the selection "the very best that could have been made."¹⁰ On the other hand, James H. Hammond, who had previously been invited by the city council of Charleston to give a memorial oration on Calhoun, considered Rhett's appointment a deliberate "contest for the crown."¹¹ At any rate, the two leading candidates for the succession went ahead with their speeches, Hammond delivering his eulogy in Charleston just a week before Rhett appeared in Columbia. Hammond gave

⁶*Appendix to the Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 1414.

⁷Richard Harrison Shryock, *Georgia and the Union in 1850* (Durham, 1926), pp. 283-285.

⁸Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), "The Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1911* (Washington, 1913), II, 210.

⁹Herndon, "The Nashville Convention of 1850," *loc. cit.*, p. 230. Shryock, *Georgia and the Union in 1850*, p. 319.

¹⁰*Charleston Daily Mercury*, April 12, 1850. *The Death and Funeral Ceremonies of John Caldwell Calhoun* (Columbia, 1850), pp. 117-118.

¹¹Elizabeth Merritt, *James Henry Hammond* (Baltimore, 1923), p. 99.

a scholarly and non-political eighteen thousand word resume of "the most prominent events in the life of Mr. Calhoun: the policy and views by which he was at various periods influenced."¹² Rhett, on the other hand, considered the eulogy on Calhoun an opportunity to argue for the ideas and ideals which he believed Calhoun represented.¹³ Without neglecting the customary treatment of the man's character and intellectual achievements, he concentrated on "the war of 1812, the tariff, and slavery. Upon his policy and speeches with respect to these great subjects, I know he chiefly rested his title to future fame."

Rhett believed that Calhoun "loved the Union for itself. He loved it, because it had been the object of his great and patriotic labors—the theatre of all his achievements. The South he loved more: 'There he had garnered up his heart, where either he must live or bear no life.' And the dread alternative of choosing between them, he could not contemplate without grief and alarm." After a description of Calhoun's last trip to Washington despite his ailing health, Rhett gave tribute to the last Calhoun speech in the Senate: "Tablets of brass or marble, on which it may be recorded, may fail; but it shall not fail in its effects. It shall live forever, in the redeemed honour and liberties of the South. It was the last flash of the sun, to show the ship of State her only port of safety, as darkness and the howling tempest closed around her." Nevertheless, Rhett conjectured that perhaps Calhoun, as widely rumored, wanted one more hour in the Senate to say "that word which dying despair could alone wring from his aching heart—disunion!"

Rhett thought that only Aristotle would rank in history with Calhoun as a political philosopher, but that many would rank above him in practical politics because Calhoun failed to enforce his policy. After praising Calhoun's "vast, simple, and grand" mind and his private life, which was his "crowning glory," Rhett turned finally to the mutual love between Calhoun and South Carolina. This he closed with the final plea: "We mourn our loss;—but, standing over his remains, we cannot but hate the tyranny that hurried him to his grave,—and love the liberty for which he lived, and wasted, and

¹²J. H. Hammond, *An Oration on the Life, Character and Service of John Caldwell Calhoun* (Charleston, 1850), p. 73.

¹³*The Death and Funeral Ceremonies of Calhoun*, pp. 119-168.

died. Cherishing his memory, we dare not be slaves. Looking to his example and precepts, we must and will be free. If his home, whilst living, was sacred to purity and honor, his last resting place shall not be *polluted* by the foul footsteps of traitors to liberty. And, when over the long track of ages to come, the star of his genius shall still shine on, to lead the nations to freedom—it shall not be forgotten that South Carolina, the land of his nativity, reared him—sustained him—and honoured him to the last.”¹⁴

In this speech Rhett not only made a powerful bid for election to the Senate and for South Carolina secession; he also revealed his mental and oratorical abilities at their best. The content of the speech is characterized by profound philosophic principles, breadth of knowledge, and clarity of structure. The rhetorical style is equally impressive. It surpasses by far anything else that Rhett left in print in the simplicity, appropriateness, and sublimity of language. His natural tendencies toward emotional intensity and overstatement, which qualifies so often resulted in his over-reaching his own powers and the capacity of his audience, attained his highest level of rhetorical splendor in the Calhoun eulogy.

Within a few weeks after Rhett's speech to the legislature it became clear that the failure of the Nashville Convention and the defeat of the secession movement in Georgia climaxed a pattern of events throughout the South. Thus, the efforts at Southern unity were to leave South Carolina isolated “without hope of outside support.” By December every state in the South except South Carolina and Mississippi had approved the compromise—some with enthusiasm, others with reservations, but none with any offer to follow South Carolina out of the Union. In face of these facts, the unionists in South Carolina began to talk more favorably of the union and to emphasize more strongly the necessity for support from other states; the cooperationists reciprocated for earlier support by following the unionist line of argument.¹⁵ But Rhett stood fast where he had been in 1844 and in June, 1850—for separate state action.

Facing the alternatives of submission or separate state secession, the South Carolina legislature devoted most of its 1850 session to

¹⁴*Ibid.*

¹⁵Avery O. Craven, *The Growth of Southern Nationalism, 1848-1861* (Baton Rouge, 1953), pp. 103-113.

debate on a large number of bills proposing a state convention and the calling of a Southern congress. The separate state action faction had majorities in both houses, but not the two-thirds necessary to call a state convention. This majority group, on the other hand, would not agree to a Southern congress bill without provisions for a state convention. With the session about to end, a compromise was worked out providing for election in October, 1851, of delegates to a proposed Southern congress. The bill proposed that the Southern congress meet in Montgomery, Alabama, in January, 1852, and that the state convention convene later to consider the recommendations of the congress.¹⁶

IN THE SENATE

The matter of secession conveniently postponed, the legislature turned to the election of a successor for Calhoun. Rhett and Hammond led the first ballot, as was expected, with fifty-six and fifty votes, respectively. Robert W. Barnwell, who was serving in an interim appointment but apparently did not want to continue in the seat, received twenty-seven, and five other nominees received token votes. With Hammond's block of votes remaining almost solid, three more ballots were required for Rhett to garner a majority from among the supporters of the other candidates, the final vote being, Rhett— 97, Hammond— 46, others— 10.¹⁷

The *Mercury* interpreted the fact that Rhett's "sole competitor on the fourth ballot . . . [was] a gentleman so nearly identical with him in political faith" to mean that "the vote may be taken as an almost unanimous decision in favor of resistance . . ."¹⁸ On the other side looking through unionist eyes, James L. Petigru construed the vote as implying "that neither was fit for the place."¹⁹ Perry, another of the unionist leaders, recorded that although "there were no two men who were more antipodes of each other than Mr. Rhett and myself in politics, . . . I had so much confidence

¹⁶Charleston *Daily Mercury*, Dec. 20, 21, 1850; Phillip May Hamer, pp. 80182; Washington *National Intelligencer*, Nov. 30-Dec. 21, 1850.

¹⁷Charleston *Daily Mercury*, Dec. 19, 1850; Washington *National Intelligencer*, Dec. 21, 1850.

¹⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁹James Petigru Carson, *Life, Letters and Speeches of James Louis Petigru, the Union Man of South Carolina* (Washington, 1920), p. 286.

in Mr. Rhett's ability and patriotism, that I supported him for the United States Senate in preference to his opponents, who were of the same party, though not so openly violent in their politics."²⁰

On January 6, 1851, more than a month after the second session^a of the thirty-first Congress began, Rhett presented his credentials and took the oath to support the Constitution of the United States.²¹ The first sectional matter to engage his attention was the Fugitive Slave Law, which he had condemned in the Nashville Address. On February 18, Clay introduced a resolution requesting President Fillmore to report to the Senate on "an alleged case of forcible resistance to the execution of a law of the United States in the city of Boston" ²² The resolution was adopted, and three days later a scathing message was received from Fillmore expressing his determination to enforce the law and suggesting minor improvements in laws concerning military observation. Clay made a brief speech supporting the President and moved that the message be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.²³

After three days of debate on the motion to refer the message Rhett got the floor. He stated his central idea at the outset: "I do not assent to the opinion expressed by many Senators here that this law will be enforced. . . I believe that by the action of the States, and the States alone, the rights of the South can be maintained and enforced." As proof of the lack of enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law Rhett contended that out of fifteen thousand slaves who had escaped into the North only about fifteen had been captured, which "in every case . . cost the master more than the worth of the slave." In keeping with his perennial procedure in Congress, Rhett turned to the Constitution. He justified his action: "I am a State-rights man. Ever since I have been in public life I have endeavored to carry out the plain and simple meaning of the Constitution of the United States. I abhor constructions." Upon careful scrutiny he could find no grant of power of Congress to legislate on fugitive slaves; thus, he considered the court opinions upholding the law: "Flat assertions—naked dogmatism—and a manifest assumption from beginning to end of the thing to be proved."

²⁰Perry, *Reminiscences of Public Men*, pp. 131, 134.

²¹*Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 178; *Washington National Intelligencer*, Jan. 7, 1851.

²²*Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 596.

²³*Ibid.*, *Appendix*, p. 292-293.

Echoing many of his previous speeches in Congress, Rhett condemned abolitionism as the real threat to the union. He quoted Calhoun from the 1833 debate with Webster to the effect that stirring up abolitionism would bring an end to the union. He closed the speech with a restatement of his own convictions "that this Union will soon come to an end, under the mighty sweep of the free States, with the consolidation principles which they have ever advocated and enforced. The wheel is destined to roll on, crushing beneath its weight interest after interest, all faith, brotherhood, and peace, until the whole fabric falls a vast pile of ruin and desolation."²⁴

When Rhett finished, Clay took the floor immediately to reply. He argued that Rhett had said nothing new and might well have presumed that the Senate already knew what he had said. Clay thought the secessionists inconsistent when they insisted upon strict interpretation of the Constitution in most matters but relied on the mode of formation of the federal government for the powers of nullification and secession. Rhett interrupted to ask if Clay would object to his replying to these observations. Clay said he would be happy to sit down and let him reply then "if he has anything to say," but that he was making only a passing mention of nullification and secession. Clay indicated that he would prefer meeting Rhett "or any of his school" in debate on a more appropriate occasion.²⁵ Rhett did not reply to Clay that session and Clay was unable to return to the next session. The President's message was committed after Clay's speech and was not reported back to the floor until near the end of the session. According to Daniel Wallace, Rhett had looked forward to engaging Clay in debate in order to refute Clay's charges of traitorous language, but was persuaded by other Senators to wait until the committee report was made on the Fugitive Slave Law. In an attempt to insure his opportunity of replying, "Mr. Rhett daily urged the chairman of the committee to make their report on the resolution."²⁶

Except for a colloquy in which he insisted that Senators' terms

²⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 317-320.

²⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 320-321.

²⁶Daniel Wallace, *The Political Life and Services of the Hon. R. Barnwell Rhett*, Pamphlet (Cahaba, Ala., 1859), p. 25.

ended at midnight on March 3,²⁷ Rhett was exceptionally quiet for the remainder of the session. However, in a short special session of the Senate which convened immediately upon adjournment of the regular session Rhett could not keep his peace. On March 10, he rose to a point of personal privilege to read a letter Senator Sam Houston had published in the *Washington Union*. Houston contended that South Carolina's constitution was "fashioned upon an aristocratic model." Rhett took up one by one Houston's allegations in support of the contention, and labeled them all wholly or partially untrue. Houston admitted that he may have made slight factual errors on government in South Carolina, but insisted upon the truth of his general charge of oligarchical government which permitted a few men to maneuver the state into supporting secession.

The next day Rhett moved that "the Senate will adjourn *sine die* at twelve o'clock tomorrow . . ." but the motion was tabled. When his motion was thus rejected Rhett explained that he had urged the Senate to meet more than three hours per day, and exploded: "I think I have done what my duty requires of me, in staying here as long as I have done; and as other duties call me elsewhere, I shall stay here no longer. To-morrow morning I return home."²⁸

While Rhett was in Washington his state had held the election, as scheduled by the legislature, for delegates to a state convention. Almost all of the candidates were declared secessionists. There was little campaign excitement and few people went to the polls. In Charleston, for example, the number of votes cast was about one-third the number cast in the election the preceding October. The unionists interpreted the small vote as meaning the people did not want to secede; the secessionists saw it as proof the people considered the issue settled in favor of secession. "Whatever the cause for the small vote, the result was to give the control of the convention into the hands of those favorable to ultimate separate secession by South Carolina."²⁹ Those favorable to separate secession claimed 127 of 169 delegates, with fewer than ten in outright opposition to secession. The Unionists did not claim that more than about seventy of the delegates were opposed to secession. Perry

²⁷*Cong. Globe*, 31 Cong., 2 Sess., p. 819.

²⁸*Ibid.*, Appendix, pp. 414-418.

²⁹Hamer, *Secession Movement in S. C.*, pp. 84-86.

headed the only union delegation elected, whereas those favorable to secession included such prominent names as Cheves, Barnwell, Pickens, ex-Governors Richardson and Seabrook, ex-Senator Huger, and Senator A. P. Butler. Rhett, who had recently established a residence in Charleston, was not a candidate, but his brother Edmund was elected from St. Helena Parish.³⁰

In face of the obvious lack of support for secession in other Southern states, the victory of the Rhett faction presented a frightening threat to the unionists and cooperationists. Thus, during the spring and summer of 1851 the campaign for the election in October of delegates to a Southern congress became a fight to the finish. Again the two groups opposed to separate state secession combined forces. Perry established, with rumors of support from Washington, the *Southern Patriot* as an organ for the opponents to secession. Such secessionists as Butler and Barnwell, who had favored cooperation all along, joined the forces of Petigru and Perry. In fact, Rhett was the only well known leader who stuck with the separate state secession movement, which was comprised mainly of younger men who dominated the Southern Rights Associations of the state. Hammond, though he had always feared Rhett's extremism, was the only prominent political figure who remained aloof from the campaign.³¹

Rhett accepted the challenge presented by the growing anti-secession movement. On April 7, to a "large and enthusiastic" audience in Charleston, he opened his campaign for the election of separate secession delegates in the October election. His case consisted of three major arguments: South Carolina must maintain her rights at all costs; other Southern states would feel compelled to support South Carolina and would subsequently follow her lead in secession; South Carolina could attract Southern trade which had been going to the North. Rhett dared a position on cooperation which he had not taken previously: "A Southern Congress now would be our ruin. . . . It would counsel submission." Rhett saw, therefore, no alternative except "submission or secession by South Carolina alone." He anticipated a peaceful separation followed by

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 87; *Charleston Daily Mercury*, Feb. 19, 1851; Laura White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett: Father of Secession* (New York, 1931), pp. 116-117.

³¹Hamer, *Secession Movement in S. C.*, pp. 88-101; Merritt, *James Henry Hammond*, pp. 102-105.

prosperity and the gradual growth of a Southern nation.³² N. W. Stephenson thought Rhett's speech "focuses the overlooked issue which is the real clue to the whole event."³³ The speech made the break clean with the cooperationists; it divided the state into two distinct camps—for or against secession.

At first, the victory seemed to be within Rhett's grasp. When the Southern Rights Association convention met in Charleston in May, the separate secessionists had an overwhelming majority among the delegates, who proceeded to adopt a set of resolutions favoring separate state secession. Rhett was a delegate but confidently avoided any open part in the proceedings. Butler, Barnwell, and Congressman James L. Orr made speeches opposing the majority report, but without success. After this Rhett victory the opposition stepped up the campaign. Rhett reciprocated with a speaking tour of the state.³⁴ In general, he repeated his arguments from the Charleston speeches of 1850 and 1851, and refuted the charges of the opposition. As the campaign became more arduous, Rhett grew more war-like. At an anniversary celebration of the battle of Fort Moultrie, Rhett responded to a toast with one of his own: "Cooperation—our fathers obtained it by seizing the stamps, and by firing the guns of Ft. Moultrie." According to the *Mercury*, "This sentiment was received with unbounded and repeated applause."³⁵

Rhett's health, which had never been equal to such strain, could not stand the pace. He became ill and went to England to recuperate, where he was said to have had some business transactions to make.³⁶ During Rhett's absence the election was held. Separate state secession was rejected by every congressional district except Rhett's own seventh. In the forty-four legislative districts, the cooperationists and unionists carried twenty-five, with a total popular vote of twenty-five thousand to seventeen thousand for the secessionists. More significant, however, is the distribution of the vote: The secessionists carried all but three of the low-county parishes; in the up-country they carried only three districts. . . .

³²Charleston *Daily Mercury*, April 8, 1851.

³³N. W. Stephenson, "Southern Nationalism in South Carolina in 1851," *The American Historical Review*, XXXVI (1930-31), p. 325.

³⁴Charleston *Daily Mercury*, June-Sept., 1851.

³⁵*Ibid.*, July 2, 1851.

³⁶*Ibid.*, Sept. 25, 1851.

Including Charleston as one, there were in South Carolina only ten districts in which the majority of the population was white; the cooperationists carried all of these, and carried eight of them by a majority of more than two to one. There were fifteen parishes in which the Negroes composed from 74 to 94 per cent of the population; the secessionists carried all but two of these, and carried them by large majorities.³⁷ The issue, even in South Carolina, was still largely a sectional one.

Defeated but determined, and apparently still weak from his illness, Rhett returned to the Senate in December. Straightaway he engaged in the most heated forensic encounter he had ever faced. Senator Henry S. Foote, who—along with most of the other Southern politicians—was eager to capitalize on the clearly indicated public support of the Compromise of 1850, introduced a motion reaffirming the confidence of the Senate in the compromise measures. On December 15 Rhett got the floor for what White considered a "remarkable speech"³⁸ in opposition to the Foote resolution. He spoke until after time for adjournment and continued the next day.

He opened with an explanation of his desire to reply to Clay before the end of the previous session, and gave notice that as soon as the Kentuckian should appear in his seat again and be able to engage in debate he would make the reply he had intended earlier. Then he moved to Foote, who had called the secessionists of South Carolina "demagogues and traitors." Pointing out that "there is not much force in epithets; they are generally the resorts of silly weakness or malignant rage," Rhett said he would disregard the charge except that it had been leveled against his state. Declaring himself "a disunionist," he proposed to "lay before the Senate the grounds" for secession sentiment in South Carolina.

Rhett showed that the Compromise of 1850 relative to the Fugitive Slave Law and the disposition of territories was disadvantageous to the South. When Foote asked to interrupt, Rhett replied: "I would prefer not to be interrupted; because the Senator has not a good temper, and mine is not much better." Next, Rhett gave a detailed historical and statistical analysis of the slavery and tariff

³⁷*Ibid.*, Oct. 29, 1851; Hamer, *Secession Movement in S. C.*, pp. 123-124.

³⁸White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett*, p. 126.

question. Thus, he came to his part in the campaign for secession and his current position on the matter: "The South can gain nothing by delay. Hence it is, that I have been for secession with other Southern States; and if they would not secede with us, I have been for secession of South Carolina alone. She can but be subjected and enslaved; we can but have those guns now mounted at Fort Moultrie and the bayonets of the soldiers within its walls used against us. We are now, nothing but an outraged and degraded colony. Worse than that—we are an insulted and endangered colony; and if we do not shortly right ourselves, in my opinion we must soon be a ruined colony."

Finally, Rhett went into constitutional arguments on the right of secession. Although he did not refer explicitly to the colloquy in the preceding session, Rhett replied to Clay's arguments: "Why, sir, the right to hold legislative assemblies, and of taxing our people, and all the other powers connected with a State government, existed before the Constitution, and are not granted by the Constitution of the United States. The right to secede, like all these powers, is a reserved right. It is a necessary incident connected with the reserved sovereignty of the States." As a transition to his final refutation of Foote he summarized: "Sir, Jefferson may be wrong, Madison may be untrue, Virginia and Kentucky may have been laboring under strong delusions, Randolph may have been a raving lunatic, and Ritchie just nobody at all, but certainly the Senator from Mississippi will acknowledge the wisdom and authority of himself. Secession must certainly now be triumphant, since it has the high sanction of his illustrious name. I hold in my hand a speech of the Senator, delivered in the Senate on the 21st March, 1850, in defence of the resolutions passed by the Mississippi Legislature."

Following the quotation from his speech, Foote interrupted to say that he denied that the Constitution sanctioned secession and that he, like Jefferson, was "a revolutionary secessionist." This prompted Rhett to deny that there could be any such thing as a revolutionary right. "A right to be a right, must carry with it the acquiescence of all persons to its exercise. I cannot have a right to do a thing and another have a right to prevent me from doing it." Therefore, Rhett inferred that when Foote had quoted Jefferson "he meant what Mr. Jefferson meant—that a State had a right to secede,

with no moral or legal right by any authority on earth to interfere with or molest her. He meant this, or he meant nothing."

Rhett did not want to close without saying a few words about Calhoun and Foote's disparaging remarks about him. He described Calhoun's final days in the Senate, and ended with a charge that Foote "not only hurried him to his grave, but now digs at it, for the purpose of exhuming, if possible, a portion of his remains, to be exposed to dishonor. Let him have all the glory of such glorious deeds. I leave him to his own thoughts—his own conscience."

After further debate on the resolution by Mason and others, Foote got the floor on December 18 and spoke for the greater portion of two days in reply to Rhett. During his speech he was frequently interrupted by Rhett to deny the accuracy of a statement or to elaborate the details of a matter mentioned by Foote. Foote quoted from the 1850 Hibernian Hall speech to the effect that Rhett became a disunionist in 1845, but, citing the speech in the 1833 state convention, he contended that Rhett had been expressing disunionist sympathies for twenty years. Rhett interrupted: "I do not care whether you say twenty or one hundred years, if I was so old. The time is of no importance."

On December 20 Rhett, under almost constant harassment by Foote, continued the personal wrangle. He began by saying that during his nineteen years in legislative bodies he had never been involved in "any personal altercation with anyone," but that since Foote had been in the Senate there had been more personal disputes in that body than for twenty years. Foote called him to order, but the exchange continued.³⁹

The Charleston *Mercury*, noting the "holy horror" in the North at Rhett's declaration of disunionism, reported the debate between Rhett and Foote with eager interest. It considered Rhett's reply to Foote "a crushing one. . . , stripping the noisy jackdaw of all his borrowed plumes, and holding him up to universal contempt, as an empty and unscrupulous charlatan." The Washington reporter for the *Mercury* thought Foote "looked and doubtless felt, like a beaten hound, and the hitherto unfailing armor of his self-conceit failed to protect his wounded vanity from the sharp shafts feathered from his own speeches. . . ." Rhett was represented, on the other hand,

³⁹*Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 96, 106, 125, 130; *Appendix*, pp. 42-65.

as analyzing the compromise and vindicating "State secession as the rightful remedy for such wrongs. . . instead of making personal retorts. . ." The *Mercury* considered his speech "equally distinguished for the frankness with which he declares his opinions, and the ability with which he defends them."⁴⁰

A few days after the encounter with Foote, Rhett left Washington for South Carolina, where he was ill for several weeks. He did not return to the Senate until late in February.⁴¹ During his absence two Senators, Jeremiah Clemens of Alabama and Lewis Cass of Michigan, had made speeches in which Rhett felt he had been reflected on personally. In reply to Rhett's speech on the Foote resolution Clemens had been particularly strong in his attack on Rhett. He had called all secessionists "fire-eaters," referred to Rhett's "inexcusable arrogance," and expressed the belief that outside of South Carolina "there is a very prevalent opinion that the Senator would never have created an extraordinary sensation, even in the kingdom of Lilliput itself."⁴²

Rhett got the floor on February 27 and, after apologizing for his delay in replying to the "animadversions of the Senator from Alabama and those (in a milder strain) of the Senator from Michigan," plunged into Clemens' attack. He quoted from a version of the speech Clemens had circulated in Alabama to the effect that Rhett was applauded by Charles Sumner, Salmon Chase, and other abolitionists at the end of his speech on the Foote resolution. Clemens interrupted: "There is a sympathy in treason as well as in knavery; and those who are earnestly striving to accomplish the same end need not quarrel about the separate means employed." Rhett called upon both Sumner and Chase to state whether they had applauded his speech; they both expressed disapproval of his secession sentiments.

Offering to let Clemens "convince himself," Rhett then enumerated from the *Congressional Globe* nine instances of speeches in which Clemens had previously condemned the compromise measures and advocated resistance by the South. He quoted Clemens' speeches at length. He also quoted letters to prove that Clemens had been

⁴⁰Charleston *Daily Mercury*, Dec. 22-30, 1851.

⁴¹*Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 637; White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett*, p. 127.

⁴²*Cong. Globe, Appendix*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 94-95.

elected in 1848 under a deal in which he had pledged to support the Whig administration. He concluded with an expression of appreciation to the Senate for permitting him the long explanation.

Clemens took the floor for a reply in which he accused Rhett of ignorance and denied that he had meant to call Rhett a knave and a traitor. "But, if I had done so, the subsequent course of that Senator justifies me in adding the epithet of coward, to that of knave and traitor." Clemens would not permit a motion to adjourn until he had branded Rhett's charge of conspiracy with the Whigs "a foul lie, unmitigated by the slightest semblance of truth." The next day Clemens continued in a milder vein, after which Rhett explained why he had not challenged Clemens to a duel: "Whilst vindicating myself on this floor, I would also vindicate the great cause with which I am identified . . . [as] a professor of the religion of Christ . . . I frankly admit that I fear God; and that I fear him more than man." Rhett laid no claim to extraordinary courage, but he said: "I am here alone; but, I trust alone without fear. Have I quailed before any of you? Senators, answer, if I have done so." He gave rebuttal on a few other points and concluded by saying that he would postpone his reply to Cass until a later date.

Clemens closed the engagement by asserting that he was Rhett's equal in every way, but had assumed from the tone of Rhett's speech that he wanted a duel. As to Rhett's religion, Clemens claimed he had never heard of it until after he had made his strong reply and consequently, toned down his language the next day. He did think, however, that Rhett's Christianity should have "prevented the provocation rather than proved an excuse for avoiding the consequences." Furthermore, Clemens wondered how he was supposed to know that Rhett was so religious "while he was cherishing in his heart of hearts a malignant bitterness which would have done credit to a fiend? How could I suppose that he was planning even at the foot of the alter a cold-blooded and deliberate assault upon the reputation of a fellow man?"⁴³

Again the *Charleston Mercury* followed the debate with daily reports. After Rhett's first speech the reporter described the debate as "a very serious encounter," and claimed that it was almost universally agreed in Washington that Clemens had "come off

⁴³*Cong. Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., pp. 640-647, 652-656.

second best With all his readiness and audacity he was reduced to a most painful and pitiful dilemma by the bare quotations from his own previous speeches. . . ." The second day of the exchange "the entrances to the Senate and the ante-rooms were blocked by crowds unable to obtain admission to the gallery. . . . Women took the reporter's gallery expecting to hear men say naughty things about each other."⁴⁴

With the state convention to convene late in April, Rhett announced in the Senate on April 7 that he was leaving for South Carolina.⁴⁵ Although other Southern states had not responded to the call for a regional congress, South Carolina had gone ahead with plans for the state convention. The majority of the delegates had been elected as separate state secessionists, but the election of the cooperationist slate in October was generally assumed to be a mandate of the people against secession. Some of the secessionists hoped to salvage some form of resistance from the convention. Efforts were made to unify the group behind a plan of Hammond's for South Carolina to withdraw from participation in federal affairs without declaring the state's independence. But the group was hopelessly divided. The major effort in the convention, therefore, was devoted to reconciliation of the political factions. The only report made by the meeting was an ordinance reaffirming the right of South Carolina to secede from the union.⁴⁶

Rhett considered the ordinance "absolute submission" to the North and, as no doubt it was, repudiation of his leadership. He promptly submitted his resignation to Governor Means, who asked him to reconsider. But Rhett could not comply. He wrote the Governor in part: "Sensible of the profound respect I owe the State as my sovereign, and deeply grateful for the many favors and honors she has conferred upon me; I bow to her declared will, and make way for those, who, with hearts less sad, and judgements more convinced, can better sustain her in the course she has determined to pursue."⁴⁷

⁴⁴Charleston *Daily Mercury*, March 3-6, 1852.

⁴⁵Cong. *Globe*, 32 Cong., 1 Sess., p. 992.

⁴⁶Hamer, *Secession Movement in S. C.*, pp. 126-143; Charleston *Daily Mercury*, March-April, 1852.

⁴⁷Charleston *Daily Mercury*, May 1, 10, 1852. Rhett's disappointment and disillusionment were intensified later that year by the death of his wife in giving birth to their twelfth child. He subsequently married Catherine Herbert Dent. (White, *Robert Barnwell Rhett*, pp. 133-134.)

CONCLUSION

Rhett's convictions were too strong, his uncompromising nature too firm, for him to continue in his seat in the Senate. Although he had longed for the position for years, he was neither willing nor able to hold it by yielding to the "peace in our time" dictates of public opinion in the South. He knew too well that the compromise measures concerned only surface phenomena without bridging the fundamental chasm between slavery and anti-slavery beliefs. As he went into what his family and friends called "profound political retirement" he could only hope that his relative youthfulness of fifty-two years would permit him to live for a resurgence of the latent desires for independence in the South.

Of one thing, however, he was more convinced than ever: the South could never be brought to act in unison. Rhett's judgment for over a decade on this matter had proved superior to that of the revered Calhoun. Perhaps Rhett knew now why it had been necessary, though, to make an attempt at unified action. Perhaps, too, he understood better than ever before the processes of persuasion. He must have known, at least, that his persuasive powers were not strong enough to do more than channel the current of public opinion in South Carolina once it was flowing strongly in his direction. But the current was not strong enough or the channel deep enough to carry a flood-tide of hope for the union. He could only wait until that tide ebbed and fresh waters poured into the stream from the hills of the South where the cotton culture was spreading.



Book Reviews

M. BLAIR HART

AMERICA'S FIRST HAMLET. By Grace Overmyer. New York: New York University Press, 1957; pp. 439; \$6.50.

Traditional accounts of John Howard Payne refer to his *Home, Sweet Home* as the source of his fame. Apparently, in these accounts, no mention is made of the point that he was the first native American to play Hamlet. As actor, theatre manager, and playwright he receives a rather low mark.

Grace Overmyer has put together a chronicle history with the aim to examine minutely all extant evidence to extend, correct, and reassign points in the traditional rating. For sheer bulk the work is impressive. 439 pages are divided into three parts. Documentation is exhaustive, with footnotes to part one numbering 137; to part two numbering 271; and to part three numbering 237. An appendix follows with samples of verse and then a bibliography of 142 items which include books and articles about Payne, about the song, collateral works theatrical (American, British, and Periodicals edited by Payne), collateral works biographical (about Americans and Britons) and collateral works historical (about the Cherokees). The listing is completed with manuscript sources from over 10 collections.

America's First Hamlet is a title which leads the reader to anticipate a vivid chronicle surrounding an occasion of moment. A single page reports this event and in vain the reader may look for a date. Odell (*Annals*, II, 317) mentions the debut of the American Roscius as Hamlet at the Park Theatre, New York, on May 31, 1809. In the book, more attention is given to Master Payne's attempts as Romeo, Zaphna, Octavian, Rolla, Tancred, Achmed and Young Norval, with the cast list for his stage debut in the latter role in *Douglas* at the Park on February 24, 1809.

An attractive jacket to this study further underscores the traditional tag that the boy prodigy was perhaps "best known as the author of 'Home, Sweet Home' " (*Oxford Companion*, 2nd Ed., p. 604). Five bars of the famous song greet the reader and somehow remain with him throughout the interesting story.

Twenty years in Britain and on the Continent (1813-1832) bring Payne into contact with an interesting period in English theatrical history. In these years, formative aspects were in the making which culminated in the impressive productions of Charles Kean and of Henry Irving. Here historical antiquarianism and spectacular staging had a beginning. Payne, unfortunately, had difficulties both financial and professional which have been variously interpreted by critics and historians. Grace Overmyer has chronicled these catastrophic events with an attempt to bring a full background of documentary evidence to give substance to the events and to adjust implications which have pursued the unlucky Payne for many years. As playwright, actor, and manager the promising Roscius had difficulties. To bring these activities into focus, three items will be mentioned.

The first is the production of Payne's play, *Brutus* (Drury Lane, Dec. 3, 1818), with Ermund Kean in the title role. This adventure apparently brought financial gain to many people, but Payne was not on that list. Attacks of plagiarism and of official condemnation made matters extremely difficult, particularly for a foreigner. The second is his management of Sadler's Wells theatre for 6 months (1820) during which time he brought serious drama to this theatre and established a regime which culminated with the famous Phelps management twenty years later. For Payne, however, the reward was a term in London's Fleet Prison for debt. The third event is the writing of the song, when he lived in an apartment at the elegant Palais Royal, Paris, for his operetta, *Clari* (Convent Garden, May 8, 1823). Ten performances are the record, although in later years the play has repeat performances in Britain, Ireland, France, and America. The song, of course, soon attained its own popularity. For this play and for the song, Payne received substantial payment beyond what is usually credited.

Payne's final twenty years in America (1832-1852) are devoted to journalism, Indian affairs in the far west, and the American consulate in Tunis.

Grace Overmyer is an engaging writer with a journalistic eye for facts and events and a descriptive ability to direct the facts and events in line with a cogent story. The book reads like a story, with the added advantage of establishing a theatre man in his theatre and of revealing items in history which are often overlooked.

The Ohio State University

JOHN H. McDOWELL

THE THEATRE IN SOVIET RUSSIA. By Nikolai A. Gorchakov. Translated by Edgar Lehrman. Columbia Slavic Studies. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957; pp. xiv + 480, illus., \$10.00.

A book about the theatre in Soviet Russia would always be welcome to theater artists and scholars in this country, but perhaps the recent cultural exchange with Russia will create a wider audience for Mr. Gorchakov's book. It is this wider audience who will get most from this history, though the specialist will still find many things of interest.

The purpose of the book as stated in the Introduction is to "... disprove—with historical facts—the Bolshevik myth that the revolution in the Russian theater began only after the cruiser *Aurora* had fired on the Winter Palace in Petrograd." This point is achieved, though the evidence has long been available to everyone in this country. A secondary purpose is Gorchakov's hope of spreading information and inspiration, for he claims that "... many of the trends, aims, ideas, and innovations of those years (the Golden Age of the Soviet Theater) are still but slightly known outside of the Soviet Union. ... Bolshevism has stifled principles and practices that would contribute to the development of the theater everywhere." This second purpose may be fulfilled if the book achieves that wider audience, for again most of the material has been available to the theater specialist. Gorchakov has underestimated the influence that the Russian theater had upon the West through the tours of the Kamerny and Moscow Art Theaters, through the visits of such directors as Glagolin who worked in educational and professional theatre in this country, through the teaching of such "non-returnees" as Mikhail Shekhov and Komisarzhovsky, through the books and works of foreign observers Norris Houghton, Kenneth Macgowan and Robert Edmond Jones.

After all, there was not always an "Iron Curtain." Then too, Gorchakov is a bit provincial in assuming all of these theatrical innovations were Russian; he does give some notice to Gordon Craig, but he omits mention of the works of Appia or any other Western European experimentalists.

The author's provincialism further shows in Part I of his book, "The Russian Theater Before the Revolution," in which he does not recognize that the evils of nineteenth century theater were not peculiar to Russia, nor that the movement for reform was active beyond the borders of his homeland. A kind of historical naivete is displayed in not recognizing that contemporary criticism of actors in regard to realism must be considered only in a relative way: he reports that a contemporary of Shchepkin (1788-1863) said, "Shchepkin alone lives on the stage," seemingly not realizing much the same thing was written of Burbage, Garrick and Macklin.

There are several errors of fact which one would not expect to find in a book with forty-five pages of notes and four and a half pages of bibliography. For instance, Gorchakov claims that the Old Theater in St. Petersburg was the only theater throughout the world in the early part of the twentieth century to revive the "magic forms connected with the old theatres;" and that the Moscow Art Theater on their tours to the West took only Byron's *Cain* and Gogol's *The Inspector General*. There are some obvious errors in translation, such as the one on p. 61, where in a description of a production the author states, "... the public could not see how the decor of the farce was raised to the fly-galleries" when the context demands a positive statement, for the director was deliberately rejecting scenic illusion by exposing the "kitchen of the stage."

The book does contain excellent statements concerning the artistic principles of Stainslavsky, Komisarzhovsky, Tairov, Meyerhold, Vakhtangov, and Evreinov. Descriptions of productions are most helpful in illuminating these abstract ideas. The illustrations (there are sixty-five, arranged chronologically covering productions from *Tsar Feodor* at the Moscow Art Theater in 1898 to the Vakhtangov Theater production of *Young Guard* in 1947), while of poor quality and small, are informative.

The theme of the book really overrides the previously stated purposes, and this is perhaps the greatest contribution Gorchakov has made in his history: "Dictatorships, including that of the Communist Party, are always conservative in their tastes, and the reason is not so much that dictators fail to grasp esthetic feelings but that they are mortally afraid of freedom of thought. Bold, 'leftist,' and experimental innovation in the theater arts are basically flights of free thought, which any tyranny or dictatorship hates and considers 'subversive.' " The public who reads this book should come to learned that expressionism and other forms of stylization often associated with the theater of social protest are not Communistic. Most of the experimentation within the Russian theater during the last forty years was done against the wishes of the Communist Party.

The Introduction states, "An objective history of the Soviet theater cannot be written in the Soviet Union." Gorchakov, while he writes authoritatively from twenty-two years experience with theater in Russia, has written with obvious bias. An objective history of the theater in Soviet Russia has yet to be written.

TELL ME A STORY. By Charles Laughton. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957; pp. vii + 392; \$5.00.

Although Charles Laughton prefaces his TELL ME A STORY with the admission that he is not an inventor of stories, he has made no ordinary, impersonal anthology. The exuberant actor who has toured the whole country reading to huge audiences tells briefly, intimately, and entertainingly his reasons for selecting each story. These autobiographical explanations are told with the chatty air of the true raconteur.

Naturally, entertainment is the book's predominant factor. Each of the sixty tales was chosen because it is fun to hear. But there are stories for almost any mood or taste. While some stories are humorous, some are serious or even solemn. Some are tender; some are tough. They range from the ancient to the contemporary. In style they vary from simple classicism to ornate romanticism; in subject matter, from Biblical stories to those of Dylan Thomas.

Variety is also evident in the types of stories. There are well-known fables from Aesop and Thurber, and some not so familiar by George Ade. Short stories by Saki and Dorothy Parker contrast with those by Sarah Orne Jewett and Dorothy Canfield Fisher. Ghost stories and tales of science fiction are represented by well-known writers such as H. G. Wells, by Ray Bradbury, and by less famous men. Anyone in the mood for children's stories can select from Hans Christian Anderson, Rudyard Kipling, Compete de Caylus, or even William Saroyan. Other types are tall tales, adventure stories, after-dinner stories, and stories of faith.

Every speech department should make this volume available to students. It is full of excellent material to read aloud; the stories are brief, entertaining, and capable of being absorbed in one hearing. Perhaps even more importantly, the volume is a vivid demonstration of how good taste, good humor, and a love of good stories can guide a person in selecting delightful program material.

In addition to the book's special appeal to students and teachers, other people will find it worth while. The reason Laughton gives for his final selection might be the reason for buying the volume: it will make the audience or the reader feel warm and hopeful. Because of its buoyant good humor TELL ME A STORY is a suitable gift for a hostess, an invalid, or a favorite friend. For anyone it would be a pleasant book to have around the house.

Southern Methodist University

EDYTH RENSHAW

MODERN THEATRE LIGHTING. By Wayne Bowman. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957; pp. xv + 228. \$3.75.

The lack of good stage lighting books has always been a severe handicap to the teacher of stage lighting course. *Modern Theatre Lighting* may very well be just the book to fill the gap.

In the preface Mr. Bowman explains, "The purpose of this book is to provide a practical, comprehensive, up-to-date guide to stage lighting in the school and community theatre. It has grown out of my own experience in teaching a college course in lighting. It is, therefore, addressed to the student—presumably of college level—and the material is organized around what I

have found to be a logical approach to the study of theatre lighting." It becomes apparent in reading the text that Mr. Bowman has amassed a great deal of good experience in practical lighting. But he has not cluttered the discussion. In highlighting and suppressing skillfully, he has brought to the reader the key phases of practical theater lighting—those phases significant in the training of the beginning student. Chapters V through XIV include a very simplified explanation of physical equipment and its uses. These chapters constitute one of the most useful approaches to stage lighting to be found anywhere in literature.

Of particular note are chapters VII, "Color and Color Media", and XIII, "The Electrical Workshop". Stripped of extraneous detail and technicality, these discussions are eminently clear and arresting. The chapter on the electrical workshop brings to light a problem universally faced by lighting technicians. Although short, the chapter gives the essential needs for repair and storage space of lighting equipment, and should prove an excellent guide to theatre architects in illustrating the need and use of this often-neglected area in the modern theatre.

Th chapter on organization, while containing an excellent section on safety precautions, is a bit short (13 pages) and contains a too brief explanation of cue sheets, setup sheets, etc. The section dealing with electronic dimmers was also a bit sketchy.

Of the six photographs included in this text, only one (the frontispiece) is of any value. Photographs, however, are not of prime importance in this book, as Mr. Bowman explains, "... a line drawing, showing only those details germane to the discussion at hand, is for instructional purposes superior to a photograph." Jean Bowman, who illustrated the text, has done a simple and quite understandable set of drawings that are certainly far superior to any photograph that could have been used.

The practical textual discussion and the clear, concise illustrations combine to make *Modern Theatre Lighting* a book that affords enjoyable reading and quick understanding. Teachers of theatre lighting, in search of a clear and down-to-earth discussion for beginning students, should examine Professor Bowman's text.

University of Arkansas

BYRNE D. BLACKWOOD

PRACTICAL SPEAKING FOR THE TECHNICAL MAN. By John E. Dietrich and Keith Brooks. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1958; pp. 310; \$4.50.

In this book one finds a text written "to provide a practical solution to the everyday speaking problems of the technical man," one that truly fulfills its purpose instead of simply using the word technical in the title.

Attractive in format, clearly organized, and easy to use, the content is "primarily concerned with getting results."

After a brief introductory chapter on "Why Speak?" the authors get down to the business of basic fundamentals of effective oral communication.

The book centers around two major purposes: (1) the clarification of basic principles, and (2) application of those principles to special types of speaking most often used by engineers and scientists. In brief, the book shows the practical procedures of *how to do the job* without entirely omitting the *why*.

The first six chapters lay the groundwork for speaking, clarify essential requirements for selecting and planning the speech, cover listener consideration, and organizing materials. One chapter is devoted to bodily action; another to voice improvement. The remaining seven introduce the reader to: informative and persuasive speaking, technical reports, interviews, conference speaking, and participating in business meetings.

Illustrations and applications of a technical nature are distributed throughout the book. At the end of each chapter is a list of suggestions, *Apply the Principles*, and a *Formula*. The first offers practical exercises to focus attention on application of the main points of the chapter. Fortunately, the lists are not so long as to be formidable or discouraging. The *Formulas*, designed for technical men, give a systematic approach to each chapter and provide scales for measuring achievement and check lists of major factors in effective speaking.

Three appendixes bring the book to a close: (1) suggested discussion questions; (2) a scale for judging effective speaking; and (3) one sample speech.

The authors might well have included several sample speeches of various types and at least one interview and discussion. These would have made the text more complete. Even without them this is the best text for its purpose to come from the press in a long time.

The University of Texas

HOWARD W. TOWNSEND

LANGUAGE: AN ENQUIRY INTO ITS MEANING AND FUNCTION. Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. Science of Culture Series. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957; pp. xviii + 366; \$4.50.

For the linguist the most interesting part of this often interesting book is N. H. Tur-Sinai's "The Origin of Language." Tur-Sinai offers one of the few profitable studies ever to have been made on this subject. His method is inductive. Language, for him, stems from the perception of relationship: demonstratives - particularly adverbs ('relationals' might have been a better term)—are the prime units. Error, or as Bloomfield would have said (*Language*, 23), analogy, leads to extension of these primary relationals; it is here that one must look for the origin of nouns and verbs. In nouns, the plural, as the more relational, preceded the singular; the oblique, the nominative; the abstract, the concrete. Similarly in the verb, relationship and analogy explain the development of tense and aspect, and in the noun, analogy governs the distinction of masculine, feminine and neuter.

Even a short summary shows the richness of Tur-Sinai's work. Some reservations must of course be made, as for instance that the material studied is Semitic and Indo-European almost exclusively. The development, too, is inevitably brief. Within these limits, however, the argument is sound; and that it might be valid far beyond the limits to which Tur-Sinai has restricted himself is very strongly suggested by Kurt Goldstein's "The Nature of Language". Dr. Goldstein's work on aphasia is well known; here he summarizes and puts forward certain general conclusions. The most important is this (p. 24): "Words used as names are not simply tools which may be handled like concrete objects but are means of detaching one from the sense experiences and of helping one to organize the world in a conceptual way." Significantly, aphasic patients have most difficulty, in Goldstein's phrase

(p. 25), with the *small words*—articles, prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, adverbs—for the most part the very units which Tur-Sinai regards as basic to speech. Goldstein distinguishes, although not in any De Saussurean sense, between language and utterance; for him the essence of language is abstraction; utterance with a merely concrete reference is "automatic speech behavior" (p. 30). Such automatisms are common in the speech of normal individuals; Goldstein treats them in a way which often parallels Tur-Sinai's discussion of error or analogy - of which, indeed, they might be regarded as one possible end-product. With the loss of power of abstraction, the patient also loses that of analogy; his automatisms are fossils of language as it existed before the brain injury caused aphasia.

This emphasis on abstraction and relationship, on the word as symbol, as the term is often rather loosely used, remains central throughout the book, and leads to results as diverse as Swami Nikhilananda writing on "Aum: the Word of Words", Huntington Cairns on the "Language of Jurisprudence", W. H. Auden on "Squares and Oblongs". The wide range of the nineteen chapters is obvious, and the reviewer can only concentrate on these which for him have a particular relevance or unusual interest. Thus Leo Spitzer's "Language of Poetry" might be singled out. Spitzer emphasizes the primitive stylization, the "atavistic prelogical residue" (p. 209) of experience, inherent in the very fact that languages have a flexion. This cannot but be emphasized by the additional stylization of prosody; poetry is "a repristination of a mythological concept symbolized by linguistic devices destined to give motivation to the arbitrary words of the language" (p. 209). Margaret Naumburg extends the concept in her "Art as Symbolic Speech" and Erich Fromm in the "Symbolic Language of Dreams." Other articles of considerable interest are Roman Jakobson's "The Cardinal Dichotomy in Language" and Jean P. de Menasce's "A Philosophy of Translation".

Opinions will differ on the value of some of the contributions to this volume. As a whole, however, it is stimulating and covers a field wider than that of most comparable books.

Washington University

JOHN MACQUEEN



NEWS AND NOTES

DON STREETER

If it were possible to find out what will happen between today, the first of August, while I am compiling this information, and the first of October—and get it in the magazine, you would probably learn of several transfers, promotions, increases in rank, etc. But that will have to wait until the next round.

Now that I have moved over here to the University of Houston and have become actively involved in the high school institute type of activity, I wish I knew about all of the programs that have been carried on this summer.

If I knew where you vacationed, it would probably interest the membership a great deal. But many of you haven't taken it yet. Maybe in another issue I can let folks know how you spent your days off.

Here are some notes on personnel, departmental activity, theatre work, and forensics accomplishments.

PERSONNEL

Auburn: Leonard Larsen has been appointed Radio-TV instructor in the Department of Speech at Auburn. He has his A.B. from Harvard, his M.A. from Northwestern, and has been on the staff of WSW-TV, Cleveland, Ohio.

Florida State University: From the University Research Council Dr. Gregg Phiper received a research assignment for the summer. His proposed study into the Trial of Andrew Johnson, 1868, was approved.

Hall High School, Little Rock: Mrs. Marguerite Metcalf of Little Rock taught summer school at Central High. Four classes in Speech were offered. This is the only high school summer school in the state. Speech courses are offered as enrichment courses for superior students.

Middlesboro High School: Mrs. Gladys DeMarcus is the President of the Kentucky Council of Teachers of English and on the summer staff at the University of Kentucky Speech and Hearing Center.

Vanderbilt University: Promotions: Robert A. Baldwin to Assistant Professor; Kenneth W. Pauli to Assistant Professor; Dwight L. Freshley to Associate Professor; Joseph E. Wright to full Professor. Dr. Freshley is on leave of absence having received a Fulbright award to teach in Athens College, Athens, Greece. He will teach English as a foreign language, direct speech contests and convocations, inaugurate a forensics program, and do research in phonetics. He will be replaced by Associate Professor Emeritus W. H. Veatch of Washington State College.

Dr. Lola Walker of Baylor was promoted to Professor beginning with the 1958-59 school year.

Dr. Ted Skinner has been promoted to Dean of the School of Fine and Applied Arts at Lamar Tech, effective in September, 1958. Dr. Skinner, who has been serving as Director of the Division of Fine and Applied Arts will continue to Head the Department of Speech. In addition to the Department of Speech, the School includes the Department of Music and Commercial Art.

Dr. Elton Abernathy, Chairman, Department of Speech, Southwest Texas

State Teachers College, has been elected President of the Texas Association of College Teachers for 1958.

With the retirement of Dr. C. M. Wise at the close of the second semester, 1958, Dr. Waldo W. Braden, Professor of Speech, was appointed chairman of the Department of Speech at Louisiana State University.

Dr. C. L. Shaver, Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University, is teaching the classes in phonetics and linguistics formerly taught by Dr. C. M. Wise.

Dr. Owen Peterson of Louisiana State University has been promoted to the rank of Associate Professor of Speech. Dr. Peterson, the current Executive Secretary of the Speech Association of America, has been at Louisiana State University for four years.

Mrs. Mary L. Davis, Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of Houston, taught a course in Effective Speaking for the Retail Merchants Association of Houston as part of their eleven-course program for the Fall of 1957.

DEPARTMENTAL ACTIVITY

The annual Summer Festival of Art at Louisiana State University included a lecture by Professor B. Iden Payne of the University of Texas. A second feature of the festival was an evening of one-act plays by Eugene O'Neill. Included on the bill, July 1 and 2, were *The Rope*, *Bound East for Cardiff*, and *Where the Cross is Made*.

Nearing completion on the campus at Louisiana State University is a new three and one-half million dollar library. The original planning committee included Dr. G. W. Gray, Professor of Speech at Louisiana State University.

Dr. John Dietrich, Professor of Speech at Ohio State University, was the conference speaker at the 24th Annual Conference on Speech Education at Louisiana State University, June 10 to 19, 1958. His lecture titles included the following: "Theatre—Fine Art of Liberal Art?," "The Theatre Audience," "Drama and the High School," "Educational Theatre Management—a Philosophy," "Dramatic Media—A Comparison," "The Aesthetics of Television," and "America and a National Theatre."

The Speech Department at Texas A. & I. has recently established a Speech and Hearing Clinic on the Campus under the direction of Doctor Jack. P. Clark. It has been set up as a service available to the students of A. & I. as well as to residents of the South Texas area.

Belmont added a full-time Assistant Professor in Drama and Speech, Mr. Howard Pelham. He will head the drama activities and is planning to take some shows on the road in addition to major productions. They have added three new scholarships in Speech and Drama. The campus forensic club is making application this summer for affiliation with a national honorary forensic fraternity. They also plan to be host to an invitational tournament for colleges and universities in their area next fall.

The 6th Annual Speech and Drama workshop for teachers and high school students was held on the campus of Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos from July 21 to August 2.

The Baylor University Speech Institute for high school students and summer workshop for teachers was held on the campus in Waco from July 10 to July 29.

The 6th Annual high school Speech Roundup at the University of Houston was held from July 28 to August 8.

The Speech Conference in honor of C. M. Wise was held May 16 and 17, 1958, at Louisiana State University. The conference opened at 2.00 p.m. on May 16, with an address of welcome by General Troy Middleton, President of L. S. U. The featured speakers for this program were Dean C. G. Taylor of the College of Arts and Sciences, L. S. U., and Dr. N. M. Caffee of the English Department of L. S. U. Dean Taylor spoke on Speech in the Humanities, and Dr. Caffee spoke on Linguistics and Speech.

Currently under construction at Louisiana State University is a new wing to the Music and Dramatics Arts Building, to be occupied exclusively by the Department of Speech. The new wing will provide additional classroom and office space. Among other features, the wing will provide a suite of three rooms planned for the teaching of discussion, two rooms connected with a recording observation room for beginning speech classes, a large television studio which can also be used as an arena theater, together with a radio room and a large control room for both radio and TV, two seminar rooms, other classrooms, a small language laboratory, a conference offices.

THEATER WORK

We list the schools and the theater productions which they have completed as follows:

Western Kentucky State College: *Goodbye, My Fancy, Arms and The Man, Fumed Oak, Giants Lie Sleeping* (original), *The Mousetrap, Nina, and Hay Fever*.

Indian Springs High School: *An Arkansas Traveller, The Trial on Tom Belcher's Store, The Crackerbarrel, Julius Caesar, and Four on a Heath*.

Southwest Texas State Teachers College: *Red Shoes, Inherit the Wind, Androcles and the Lion, and Carousel*.

Vanderbilt University: *Arsenic and Old Lace, House of Bernarda Alba, Playboy of the Western World, and The Miser*.

Hall High School: *Night of January 16th, Red Carnations, Happy Journey, Two Crooks and a Lady, and A Pair of Lunatics*.

FORENSICS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Last year the following schools participated in these tournaments and won these honors:

Hall High School: Sponsored State Debate Clinic for high schools, Baylor Tournament, Glendy Burke, State Speech Festival at Henderson State, and Southern Congress. They received honors by winning the State Voice of Democracy Contest and they were among the twelve finalists in the nation. They won the state American Legion oratorical contest.

Indian Springs High School: University of Alabama Speech Tournament, Southern Speech Association Tournament, Sons of American Revolution Oratorical Contest, and Alabama College Drama Festival. Honors won were Superior in Interpretive Reading, Superior in Oration at the S. S. A. Convention, and Superior in Interpretive Reading at the University of Alabama.

Jackson High School, Miami: Florida Forensics, Florida N. F. L., Tulane University, Southern Speech Association, four local tournaments, and Florida

Forensic Congress. They won honors in Florida Senator to National Congress, State N. F. S. Extempore, State Debate, Florida Extempore, S. S. A.—Superior in Debate, Extempore and Oratory, and five state winners earned the trip to the national N. F. L. in Sioux Fall, South Dakota.

Southwest Texas State Teachers College: Texas Women's, Texas A & M Forensic, Southern Speech Association, Texas Lutheran, Abilene Christian, and University of Texas Roundup.

Vanderbilt University: TKA Southern Region, Millsaps Tourney, Tennessee State Tourney, Magnolia Tournament, Marx-Xavier Tournament, Southern Speech Association, and TKA National. In honors they won the Regional TKA in Debate, and the National TKA in Discussion. All in all in Debate they had 91 wins and 43 losses.

Western Kentucky State College: Kentucky Wesleyan Debate, Western Kentucky Debate, Kentucky Debate, Indiana University Hoosier Debate, Vanderbilt University Debates, and Southern Speech Association Debate Tournaments. They won first place in debate at Kentucky Wesleyan and Indiana.

In their ninth year of intercollegiate competition, FSU debaters and discussers won several medals, a sheaf of certificates, and an excellent reputation both regionally and nationally. Travels took them throughout the Southeast: Gainesville and Miami in Florida, Decatur and Carrollton in Georgia, Tuscaloosa and Mobile in Alabama, Hattiesburg and Columbus in Mississippi, Lexington in Kentucky. In addition, thirteen schools from eight states came to Tallahassee for the Ninth Annual FSU Invitational Tournament, and FSU served as host for twenty-two schools at the Ninth Annual Florida State High School Congress held in the State Capitol in November. FSU won honors by rating first in affirmative and negative at the West Georgia Invitational.

ss,
ed
M
n,
n-
nt,
he
in
rn
te,
te
nd
nd
u-
he
in
us
m
al
th
in
at